arXiv:1405.2190v2 [math.OC] 31 Oct 2014

Strong Duality Theorem for Continuous-Time Linear Programming Problems

Hsien-Chung Wu *

Department of Mathematics,
National Kaohsiung Normal University, Kaohsiung 802, Taiwan

Abstract

This paper is aimed to prove the strong duality theorem for continuous-time linear programming problems in which the coefficients are assumed to be piecewise continuous functions. The previous paper proved the strong duality theorem for the case of piecewise continuous functions in which the discontinuities are the left-continuities. In this paper, we propose the completely different type of discretized primal and dual problems that can be used to prove the strong duality theorem for the general situation of discontinuities.

Keywords: Continuous-time linear programming problems, Weak duality theorem, Strong duality theorem, Discretized problems, Perturbed optimization problems

AMS Subject Classification: 90C05; 90C46; 90C90

1 Introduction

In Wu [20, 21], the coefficients appeared in the discretized primal and dual problems are the function values of the coefficient functions taken at the right-end points of the subdivided intervals. This simple type of formulation can just be used to prove the strong duality theorem for the case of piecewise continuous functions in which the discontinuities are the left-continuities. In this paper, we shall extend to prove the strong duality theorem for the general situation of discontinuities. We shall propose the completely different type of formulation for the discretized primal and dual problems. In this paper, the coefficients in the discretized primal and dual problems will consider the infimum and supremum of the coefficient functions on the subdivided intervals, which is more complicated than that of considering the function values of the coefficient functions taken at the right-end points of the subdivided intervals in Wu [20, 21].

The theory of continuous-time linear programming problem has received considerable attention for a long time. Tyndall [17, 18] treated rigorously a continuous-time linear programming problem with constant matrices, which had originated from the "bottleneck problem" proposed by Bellman [4]. Levinson [6] generalized the results of Tyndall by considering time-dependent matrices in which the functions appearing in the objective and constraints were assumed to be continuous on the time interval $[0, T]$. Meidan and Perold [7], Papageorgiou [8] and Schechter [16] have also obtained some interesting results for the continuous-time linear programming problem. Anderson *et al.* [1, 2, 3], Fleischer and Sethuraman [5] and Pullan [9, 10, 11, 12, 13] investigated a subclass of continuous-time linear programming problems, which is called separated continuous-time linear programming

*e-mail: hcwu@nknucc.nknu.edu.tw

problem and can be used to model the job-shop scheduling problems. Weiss [19] proposed a simplex-like algorithm to solve the separated continuous-time linear programming problem.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the problem formulation is presented, and the weak duality theorem is proved. In Section 3, in order to study the strong duality theorem, we propose a perturbed continuous-time linear programming problem. Many useful results that will be used to prove the strong duality theorem are derived. In Section 4, discretized problems are formulated in which the partition of the time interval $[0,T]$ is not taken as equally dividing $[0,T]$. We also derive many useful results that will be used to prove the strong duality theorem. In Section 5, the strong duality theorem is proved.

2 Formulation

Let A be a matrix with entries denoted by a_{ij}. We define $\| A \| = \sum_{i,j} |a_{ij}|$. Let $L_p^\infty[0,T]$ be the space of all measurable and essentially bounded functions from the compact interval $[0,T]$ into the p-dimensional Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^p$. If $p=1$, Then, we simply write $L^\infty[0,T]$. For $f \in L^\infty[0,T]$, we define

$$\| f \|_\infty = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t\in[0,T]} |f(t)| = \inf\{k : |f(t)| \le k \text{ a.e. in } [0,T]\},$$

where the Lebesgue measure is considered. Therefore, we have $|f(t)| \le \| f \|_\infty$ a.e. in $[0,T]$. For $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \cdots, f_p) \in L_p^\infty[0,T]$, we define

$$\| \mathbf{f} \|_\infty^p = \max_{i=1,\cdots,p} \| f_i \|_\infty .$$

We consider the following assumptions:

- $\mathbf{a} \in L_q^\infty[0,T]$ and $\mathbf{c} \in L_p^\infty[0,T]$;
- B and K are time-dependent $p \times q$ matrices defined on $[0,T]$ and $[0,T]\times[0,T]$, respectively, such that each entry is in the spaces $L^\infty[0,T]$ and $L^\infty([0,T]\times[0,T])$, respectively.

The continuous-time linear programming problem is formulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{CLP}^*) \qquad \max \quad & \int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t)\mathbf{z}(t)dt \\ \text{subject to} \quad & B(t)\mathbf{z}(t) \le \mathbf{c}(t) + \int_0^t K(t,s)\mathbf{z}(s)ds \text{ for all } t \in [0,T], \\ & \mathbf{z} \in L_q^\infty[0,T] \text{ and } \mathbf{z}(t) \ge \mathbf{0} \text{ for all } t \in [0,T]. \end{aligned}$$

The dual problem of (CLP*) is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{DCLP}^*) \qquad \min \quad & \int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\mathbf{w}(t)dt \\ \text{subject to} \quad & B^\top(t)\mathbf{w}(t) \ge \mathbf{a}(t) + \int_t^T K^\top(s,t)\mathbf{w}(s)ds \text{ for all } t \in [0,T], \\ & \mathbf{w} \in L_p^\infty[0,T] \text{ and } \mathbf{w}(t) \ge \mathbf{0} \text{ for all } t \in [0,T]. \end{aligned}$$

In this paper, we shall consider the following problems:

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{CLP}) \qquad \max \quad & \int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t)\mathbf{z}(t)dt \\ \text{subject to} \quad & B(t)\mathbf{z}(t) \le \mathbf{c}(t) + \int_0^t K(t,s)\mathbf{z}(s)ds \text{ a.e. in } [0,T], \\ & \mathbf{z} \in L_q^\infty[0,T] \text{ and } \mathbf{z}(t) \ge \mathbf{0} \text{ a.e. in } [0,T] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}(\text{DCLP}) \qquad \min \quad & \int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\mathbf{w}(t)dt \\ \text{subject to} \quad & B^\top(t)\mathbf{w}(t) \geq \mathbf{a}(t) + \int_t^T K^\top(s,t)\mathbf{w}(s)ds \text{ a.e. in } [0,T], \\ & \mathbf{w} \in L_p^\infty[0,T] \text{ and } \mathbf{w}(t) \geq \mathbf{0} \text{ a.e. in } [0,T],\end{aligned}$$

where the constraints are assumed to be satisfied in the sense of a.e. in $[0,T]$. The weak duality theorem can be similarly established although the primal and dual problems (CLP) and (DCLP) are defined in the sense of a.e. in $[0,T]$.

Theorem 2.1. (Weak Duality Theorem) *If* $\mathbf{z}$ *and* $\mathbf{w}$ *are any arbitrary feasible solutions of the primal and dual problems* (CLP) *and* (DCLP)*, respectively, then*

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t)\mathbf{z}(t)dt \leq \int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\mathbf{w}(t)dt.$$

Proof. According to the constrains of problems (CLP) and (DCLP), we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q}\int_0^T z_j(t)\left[a_j(t) - \sum_{i=1}^{p} B_{ij}(t)w_i(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{p}\int_t^T K_{ij}(s,t)w_i(s)ds\right]dt \leq 0 \tag{1}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p}\int_0^T w_i(t)\left[c_i(t) - \sum_{j=1}^{q} B_{ij}(t)z_j(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{q}\int_0^t K_{ij}(t,s)z_j(s)ds\right]dt \geq 0. \tag{2}$$

By Fubini's theorem, we also have

$$\int_0^T\int_t^T K_{ij}(s,t)z_j(t)w_i(s)dsdt = \int_0^T\int_0^t K_{ij}(t,s)z_j(s)w_i(t)dsdt. \tag{3}$$

Therefore, in the vectorial form, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}0 \geq & \int_0^T \mathbf{z}^\top(t)\left[\mathbf{a}(t) - B^\top(t)\mathbf{w}(t) + \int_t^T K^\top(s,t)\mathbf{w}(s)ds\right]dt \\ & - \int_0^T \mathbf{w}^\top(t)\left[\mathbf{c}(t) - B(t)\mathbf{z}(t) + \int_0^t K(t,s)\mathbf{z}(s)ds\right]dt \text{ (by (1) and (2))} \\ = & \int_0^T \mathbf{z}^\top(t)\mathbf{a}(t)dt + \int_0^T \mathbf{w}^\top(t)\left[-B(t)\mathbf{z}(t) + \int_0^t K(t,s)\mathbf{z}(s)ds\right]dt \text{ (by (3))} \\ & - \int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\mathbf{w}(t)dt - \int_0^T \mathbf{w}^\top(t)\left[-B(t)\mathbf{z}(t) + \int_0^t K(t,s)\mathbf{z}(s)ds\right]dt \\ = & \int_0^T \mathbf{z}^\top(t)\mathbf{a}(t)dt - \int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\mathbf{w}(t)dt.\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. ■

In the sequel, we are going to prove the strong duality theorem between (CLP) and (DCLP) although these problems are considered in the sense of a.e. in $[0,T]$.

3 Perturbed Formulation

Given any $\epsilon \geq 0$, we consider the following perturbed problems:

$$\begin{aligned}(\text{CLP}_\epsilon) \qquad \max \quad & \int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t)\mathbf{z}(t)dt \\ \text{subject to} \quad & B(t)\mathbf{z}(t) \leq [\mathbf{c}(t) + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}] + \int_0^t K(t,s)\mathbf{z}(s)ds \text{ a.e. in } [0,T], \\ & \mathbf{z} \in L_q^\infty[0,T] \text{ and } \mathbf{z}(t) \geq \mathbf{0} \text{ a.e. in } [0,T]\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}(\text{DCLP}_\epsilon) \qquad \min \quad & \int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\mathbf{w}(t)dt \\ \text{subject to} \quad & B^\top(t)\mathbf{w}(t) \geq [\mathbf{a}(t) - \boldsymbol{\epsilon}] + \int_t^T K^\top(s,t)\mathbf{w}(s)ds \text{ a.e. in } [0,T], \\ & \mathbf{w} \in L_p^\infty[0,T] \text{ and } \mathbf{w}(t) \geq \mathbf{0} \text{ a.e. in } [0,T],\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ is a vector with all entries ϵ. Although the vectors $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ in problems (CLP_ϵ) and (DCLP_ϵ) have the different dimensions, we use the same notation for convenience. If the constraints of (CLP_ϵ) and (DCLP_ϵ) are assumed to be satisfied for all $t \in [0,T]$, then the corresponding problems are denoted by (CLP_ϵ^*) and (DCLP_ϵ^*).

Since each entry of $\mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{c}$, B and K is measurable and essentially bounded in $[0,T]$ and $[0,T]\times[0,T]$, respectively, we define

$$\tau = \max_{j=1,\cdots,q} \| a_j \|_\infty; \text{ that is, } |a_j(t)| \leq \tau \text{ a.e. in } [0,T], \tag{4}$$

$$\zeta = \max_{i=1,\cdots,p} \| c_i \|_\infty; \text{ that is, } |c_i(t)| \leq \zeta \text{ a.e. in } [0,T], \tag{5}$$

$$\eta = \max_{i=1,\cdots,p;j=1,\cdots,q} \| K_{ij} \|_\infty; \text{ that is, } |K_{ij}(t,s)| \leq \eta \text{ a.e. in } [0,T]\times[0,T], \tag{6}$$

$$\nu = \max_{j=1,\cdots,q} \sum_{i=1}^{p} \| K_{ij} \|_\infty; \text{ that is, } \sum_{i=1}^{p} |K_{ij}(t,s)| \leq \nu \text{ a.e. in } [0,T]\times[0,T], \tag{7}$$

$$\phi = \max_{i=1,\cdots,p} \sum_{j=1}^{q} \| K_{ij} \|_\infty; \text{ that is, } \sum_{j=1}^{q} |K_{ij}(t,s)| \leq \phi \text{ a.e. in } [0,T]\times[0,T]. \tag{8}$$

Let $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of functions in $L^\infty[0,T]$. We say that the sequence $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is uniformly essentially bounded in $[0,T]$ if and only if there exists a positive constant C such that $\| f_k \|_\infty \leq C$ for each k. If $\{\mathbf{f}_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is a sequence of vector-valued functions, Then, we say that the sequence $\{\mathbf{f}_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is uniformly essentially bounded if and only if there exists a positive constant C such that $\| f_{ik} \|_\infty \leq C$ for each i and k, where f_{ik} is the ith entry of $\mathbf{f}_k$. For $f \in L^2[0,T]$, we recall

$$\| f \|_2 = \left(\int_0^T f^2(t)dt \right)^{1/2}.$$

Then, the sequence $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of real-valued functions is uniformly bounded in $[0,T]$ with respect to $\| \cdot \|_2$ if and only if there exists a positive constant C such that $\| f_k \|_2 \leq C$ for each k. The concept of uniform boundedness of the sequence of vector-valued functions $\{\mathbf{f}_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ can be similarly defined. We also see that if the sequence $\{\mathbf{f}_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is uniformly essentially bounded in $[0,T]$, then it is also uniformly bounded in $[0,T]$ with respect to $\| \cdot \|_2$.

We denote by $\mathcal{Z}_\epsilon$ and $\mathcal{W}_\epsilon$ the feasible sets of problems (CLP_ϵ) and (DCLP_ϵ), respectively. We say that the feasible set $\mathcal{Z}_\epsilon$ of (CLP_ϵ) is uniformly essentially bounded if and only if there exists a

positive constant C such that each feasible solution of (CLP_ϵ) is essentially bounded by C. We are going to provide the sufficient conditions to guarantee that the feasible set $\mathcal{Z}_\epsilon$ of (CLP_ϵ) is uniformly essentially bounded. Gronwall's lemma was provided by Levinson [6]. We can similarly prove it in the sense of a.e. in $[0,T]$.

Lemma 3.1. (Gronwall's lemma) *Suppose that the real-valued function g is integrable in $[0,T]$ and $g(t) \geq 0$ a.e. in $[0,T]$ (resp. for all $t \in [0,T]$). If there exist constants $\theta_1 \geq 0$ and $\theta_2 > 0$ such that*

$$g(t) \leq \theta_1 + \theta_2 \cdot \int_0^t g(s)ds \text{ a.e. in } [0,T] \text{ (resp. for all } t \in [0,T]), \tag{9}$$

then $g(t) \leq \theta_1 \cdot e^{\theta_2 t}$ a.e in $[0,T]$ (resp. for all $t \in [0,T]$).

Proof. We are going to prove the case of a.e. on $[0,T]$. For $t \in [0,T]$, we define

$$G(t) = \int_0^t g(s)ds.$$

Then, we see that G is continuous on $[0,T]$ and $G'(t) = g(t)$ a.e. on $[0,T]$ by Royden [15]. From (9), we also have

$$g(t) \leq \theta_1 + \theta_2 G(t) \text{ a.e. on } [0,T]. \tag{10}$$

Using (10), we also have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\left(e^{-\theta_2 t}G(t)\right) &= -\theta_2 e^{-\theta_2 t}G(t) + e^{-\theta_2 t}g(t) \\ &\leq -\theta_2 e^{-\theta_2 t}G(t) + e^{-\theta_2 t}\cdot(\theta_1 + \theta_2 G(t)) = \theta_1 e^{-\theta_2 t} \text{ a.e. on } [0,T].\end{aligned}$$

By taking integration, for $t \in [0,T]$, we have

$$\int_0^t \frac{d}{dt}\left(e^{-\theta_2 s}G(s)\right)ds \leq \int_0^t \theta_1 e^{-\theta_2 s}ds. \tag{11}$$

Since $e^{-\theta_2 s}G(s)$ is continuous on $[0,T]$, the Lebesgue integral and Riemann integral are identical as given in (11). Therefore, we have

$$e^{-\theta_2 t}G(t) - G(0) \leq -\frac{\theta_1}{\theta_2}e^{-\theta_2 t} + \frac{\theta_1}{\theta_2}$$

for each $t \in [0,T]$. Since $G(0) = 0$, we have

$$G(t) \leq \frac{\theta_1}{\theta_2}\left(e^{\theta_2 t} - 1\right) \tag{12}$$

for each $t \in [0,T]$. Using (10) and (12), we obtain

$$g(t) \leq \theta_1 + \theta_2 G(t) \leq \theta_1 + \theta_2 \cdot \frac{\theta_1}{\theta_2}\left(e^{\theta_2 t} - 1\right) = \theta_1 e^{\theta_2 t} \text{ a.e. on } [0,T].$$

This completes the proof. ■

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose that there exist real-valued functions λ_i satisfying $0 \leq \lambda_i(t) \leq 1$ a.e. in $[0,T]$ (resp. for all $t \in [0,T]$) for $i = 1, \cdots, p$ and a constant $\sigma > 0$ satisfying*

$$\min_{j=1,\cdots,q}\left\{\sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i(t)B_{ij}(t)\right\} \geq \sigma \text{ a.e. in } [0,T] \text{ (resp. for all } t \in [0,T]).$$

If the problem (CLP_ϵ) *is feasible, then each feasible solution* $\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon)}(t)$ *is bounded satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned}\left|z_j^{(\epsilon)}(t)\right| \leq \| \mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \| &\leq \frac{p\cdot(\zeta+\epsilon)}{\sigma}\cdot\exp\left(\frac{p\cdot\phi\cdot t}{\sigma}\right)\\ &\leq \frac{p\cdot(\zeta+\epsilon)}{\sigma}\cdot\exp\left(\frac{p\cdot\phi\cdot T}{\sigma}\right) \text{ a.e. in } [0,T] \text{ (resp. for all } t\in[0,T])\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

for $j=1,\cdots,q$, *where the constants* ζ *and* ϕ *are given in* (5) *and* (6), *respectively. In other words, the feasible set* $\mathcal{Z}_\epsilon$ *of* (CLP_ϵ) *is uniformly essentially bounded in* $[0,T]$ *when* ϵ *is fixed.*

Proof. We are going to prove the case of a.e. in $[0,T]$. Let $\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon)}$ be a feasible solution of (CLP_ϵ). According to the constraints, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{j=1}^{q}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\lambda_i(t)\cdot B_{ij}(t)\cdot z_j^{(\epsilon)}(t)\\ &\quad\leq \sum_{i=1}^{p}\lambda_i(t)\cdot|c_i(t)+\epsilon| + \int_0^t\sum_{j=1}^{q}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\lambda_i(t)\cdot K_{ij}(t,s)\cdot z_j^{(\epsilon)}(s)ds \text{ a.e. in } [0,T].\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma\cdot\| \mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \| &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{q}\left[\left|z_j^{(\epsilon)}(t)\right|\cdot\sum_{i=1}^{p}\lambda_i(t)B_{ij}(t)\right] = \sum_{j=1}^{q}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\lambda_i(t)\cdot B_{ij}(t)\cdot\left|z_j^{(\epsilon)}(t)\right|\\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{p}\lambda_i(t)\cdot|c_i(t)+\epsilon| + \int_0^t\sum_{i=1}^{p}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{q}\lambda_i(t)\cdot K_{ij}(t,s)\cdot\left|z_j^{(\epsilon)}(s)\right|ds\right]\\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{p}|c_i(t)+\epsilon| + \int_0^t\sum_{i=1}^{p}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{q}K_{ij}(t,s)\cdot\left|z_j^{(\epsilon)}(s)\right|ds\right]\\ &\leq p\cdot(\zeta+\epsilon) + p\cdot\phi\cdot\int_0^t\| \mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon)}(s) \| ds \text{ a.e. in } [0,T].\end{aligned}$$

By Gronwall's Lemma 3.1, we obtain

$$\| \mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \| \leq \frac{p\cdot(\zeta+\epsilon)}{\sigma}\cdot\exp\left(\frac{p\cdot\phi\cdot t}{\sigma}\right) \leq \frac{p\cdot(\zeta+\epsilon)}{\sigma}\cdot\exp\left(\frac{p\cdot\phi\cdot T}{\sigma}\right) \text{ a.e. in } [0,T].$$

This completes the proof. ■

The following lemmas are very useful.

Lemma 3.2. (Riesz and Sz.-Nagy [14, p.64]) *Let* $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ *be a sequence in* $L^2[0,T]$. *If the sequence* $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ *is uniformly bounded with respect to* $\|\cdot\|_2$, *then there exists a subsequence* $\{f_{k_r}\}_{r=1}^{\infty}$ *which weakly converges to some* $f_0\in L^2[0,T]$. *In other words, for any* $g\in L^2[0,T]$, *we have*

$$\lim_{r\to\infty}\int_0^T f_{k_r}(t)g(t)dt = \int_0^T f_0(t)g(t)dt.$$

Lemma 3.3. (Levinson [6]) *If the sequence* $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ *is uniformly bounded in* $[0,T]$ *with respect to* $\|\cdot\|_2$ *and weakly converges to some* $f_0\in L^2[0,T]$, *then*

$$f_0(t)\leq\limsup_{k\to\infty}f_k(t) \text{ a.e. in } [0,T]$$

and

$$f_0(t)\geq\liminf_{k\to\infty}f_k(t) \text{ a.e. in } [0,T].$$

Proposition 3.2. *Consider the sequence* $\{\epsilon_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ *with* $\epsilon_k \to 0+$ *as* $k \to \infty$. *Assume that* $B(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ *a.e. in* $[0,T]$. *The following statements hold true.*

(i) *Suppose that each problem* $(\mathrm{CLP}_{\epsilon_k})$ *is feasible, and that* $\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon_k)}$ *is a feasible solution of problem* $(\mathrm{CLP}_{\epsilon_k})$ *such that the sequence* $\{\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon_k)}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ *is uniformly essentially bounded. Then, there exists a subsequence* $\{\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}\}_{r=1}^{\infty}$ *which weakly converges to some feasible solution* $\mathbf{z}^{(0)} \in L_q^2[0,T]$ *of* $(\mathrm{CLP}_0) = (\mathrm{CLP})$. *Moreover, there exists a feasible solution* $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$ *of* (CLP) *such that* $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ *for all* $t \in [0,T]$ *and* $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(t) = \mathbf{z}^{(0)}(t)$ *a.e. in* $[0,T]$.

(ii) *Suppose that* $\mathbf{c}(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ *for all* $t \in [0,T]$, *and that* $K(t_0,s) \geq \mathbf{0}$ *a.e. in* $[0,T]$ *for each fixed* $t_0 \in [0,T]$. *If the sequence* $\{\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon_k)}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ *of feasible solutions of problem* $(\mathrm{CLP}_{\epsilon_k})$ *is uniformly essentially bounded, then there exists a subsequence* $\{\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}\}_{r=1}^{\infty}$ *which weakly converges to some feasible solution* $\mathbf{z}^{(0)} \in L_q^2[0,T]$ *of* (CLP). *Moreover, there exists a feasible solution* $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$ *of* (CLP^*) *such that* $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(t) = \mathbf{z}^{(0)}(t)$ *a.e. in* $[0,T]$.

Proof. To prove part (i), since the sequence $\{\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon_k)}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is uniformly essentially bounded in $[0,T]$, it follows that this sequence is also uniformly bounded in $[0,T]$ with respect to $\|\cdot\|_2$. Let $z_j^{(\epsilon_k)}$ be the jth entry of $\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon_k)}$. Using Lemma 3.2, there exists a subsequence of $\{z_j^{(\epsilon_k)}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ which weakly converges to some $z_j^{(0)}(t) \in L^2[0,T]$. Therefore, we can construct a vector-valued subsequence $\{\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}\}_{r=1}^{\infty}$ of $\{\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon_k)}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ such that $\{z_j^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}\}_{r=1}^{\infty}$ weakly converges to $z_j^{(0)}$ for $j = 1, \cdots, q$. For each $i = 1, \cdots, p$, the constraints say that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q} B_{ij}(t) \cdot z_j^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}(t) \leq c_i(t) + \epsilon_{k_r} + \sum_{j=1}^{q} \int_0^t K_{ij}(t,s) \cdot z_j^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}(s) ds \text{ a.e. in } [0,T]. \tag{14}$$

Using Lemma 3.3, we also have

$$\limsup_{r\to\infty} z_j^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}(t) \geq z_j^{(0)}(t) \geq \liminf_{r\to\infty} z_j^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}(t) \geq 0 \text{ a.e. in } [0,T]. \tag{15}$$

Since $\epsilon_{k_r} \to 0$ as $r \to \infty$ and $B(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e. in $[0,T]$, from (19) and (20), by taking the limit superior and using the weak convergence, we obtain

$$B(t)\mathbf{z}^{(0)}(t) \leq \limsup_{r\to\infty} B(t)\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}(t) \leq \mathbf{c}(t) + \int_0^t K(t,s)\mathbf{z}^{(0)}(s) ds \text{ a.e. in } [0,T]. \tag{16}$$

This shows that $\mathbf{z}^{(0)}$ is a feasible solution of (CLP). Let $N_{0j} = \{t \in [0,T] : z_j^{(0)}(t) < 0\}$ and $N_0 = \bigcup_{j=1}^{q} N_{0j}$. Let N_1 be the subset of $[0,T]$ such that the inequality (21) is violated. We define $N = N_0 \cup N_1$. Then from (20) and (21), we see that the set N has measure zero. Now, we define

$$\bar{\mathbf{z}}(t) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{z}^{(0)}(t) & \text{if } t \notin N \\ \mathbf{0} & \text{if } t \in N. \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

Then, we see that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in [0,T]$ and $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(t) = \mathbf{z}^{(0)}(t)$ a.e. in $[0,T]$. For $t \notin N$, from (21), we have

$$B(t)\bar{\mathbf{z}}(t) = B(t)\mathbf{z}^{(0)}(t) \leq \mathbf{c}(t) + \int_0^t K(t,s)\mathbf{z}^{(0)}(s) ds = \mathbf{c}(t) + \int_0^t K(t,s)\bar{\mathbf{z}}(s) ds. \tag{18}$$

This shows that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$ is a feasible solution of (CLP).

To prove part (ii), under the assumptions of $\mathbf{c}(t)$ and $K(t,s)$, it is obvious that the problem $(\mathrm{CLP}_{\epsilon_k})$ is feasible for each ϵ_k with the trivial feasible solution $\mathbf{z}(t) = \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in [0,T]$. We

consider $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$ defined in (22). For $t \in N$, we have $B(t)\bar{\mathbf{z}}(t) = \mathbf{0}$. Since $\mathbf{z}^{(0)}(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e. in $[0,T]$ and $K(t_0,s) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e. in $[0,T]$ for each fixed $t_0 \in [0,T]$, we obtain

$$B(t)\bar{\mathbf{z}}(t) = \mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{c}(t) + \int_0^t K(t,s)\mathbf{z}^{(0)}(s)ds = \mathbf{c}(t) + \int_0^t K(t,s)\bar{\mathbf{z}}(s)ds.$$

By referring to (23) for $t \notin N$, we see that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(t)$ satisfies all the constraints of primal problem (CLP) for all $t \in [0,T]$. This completes the proof. ■

Proposition 3.3. *Assume that $B(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e. in $[0,T]$. The following statements hold true.*

(i) *Suppose that the problem (CLP_ϵ) is feasible. For any uniformly essentially bounded sequence $\{\mathbf{z}^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of feasible solutions of (CLP_ϵ), there exists a subsequence $\{\mathbf{z}^{(k_r)}\}_{r=1}^\infty$ which weakly converges to some feasible solution $\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon)} \in L_q^2[0,T]$ of (CLP_ϵ). Moreover, there exists a feasible solution $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}$ of (CLP_ϵ) such that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in [0,T]$ and $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) = \mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon)}(t)$ a.e. in $[0,T]$.*

(ii) *Suppose that $\mathbf{c}(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in [0,T]$, and that $K(t_0,s) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e. in $[0,T]$ for each fixed $t_0 \in [0,T]$. Given any uniformly essentially bounded sequence $\{\mathbf{z}^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of feasible solutions of (CLP_ϵ), there exists a subsequence $\{\mathbf{z}^{(k_r)}\}_{r=1}^\infty$ which weakly converges to some feasible solution $\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon)} \in L_q^2[0,T]$ of (CLP_ϵ). Moreover, there exists a feasible solution $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}$ of $(\mathrm{CLP}_\epsilon^*)$ such that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) = \mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon)}(t)$ a.e. in $[0,T]$.*

Proof. To prove part (i), since the sequence $\{\mathbf{z}^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is uniformly essentially bounded in $[0,T]$, we see that this sequence is also uniformly bounded in $[0,T]$ with respect to $\|\cdot\|_2$. Using Lemma 3.2, there exists a subsequence of $\{z_j^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ which weakly converges to some $z_j^{(\epsilon)} \in L^2[0,T]$. Therefore, we can construct a vector-valued subsequence $\{\mathbf{z}^{(k_r)}\}_{r=1}^\infty$ of $\{\mathbf{z}^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ such that $\{z_j^{(k_r)}\}_{r=1}^\infty$ weakly converges to $z_j^{(\epsilon)}$ for $j = 1, \cdots, q$. For each $i = 1, \cdots, p$, the feasibility says that

$$\sum_{j=1}^q B_{ij}(t) \cdot z_j^{(k_r)}(t) \leq c_i(t) + \epsilon + \sum_{j=1}^q \int_0^t K_{ij}(t,s) \cdot z_j^{(k_r)}(s)ds \text{ a.e. in } [0,T]. \tag{19}$$

Using Lemma 3.3, we also have

$$\limsup_{r\to\infty} z_j^{(k_r)}(t) \geq z_j^{(\epsilon)}(t) \geq \liminf_{r\to\infty} z_j^{(k_r)}(t) \geq 0 \text{ a.e. in } [0,T]. \tag{20}$$

Since $B(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e. in $[0,T]$, from (19) and (20), by taking the limit superior and using the weak convergence, we obtain

$$B(t)\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \leq \limsup_{r\to\infty} B(t)\mathbf{z}^{(k_r)}(t) \leq \mathbf{c}(t) + \boldsymbol{\epsilon} + \int_0^t K(t,s)\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon)}(s)ds \text{ a.e. in } [0,T]. \tag{21}$$

This shows that $\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon)}$ is a feasible solution of (CLP_ϵ). Let $N_{0j} = \{t \in [0,T] : z_j^{(\epsilon)}(t) < 0\}$ and $N_0 = \bigcup_{j=1}^q N_{0j}$. Let N_1 be the subset of $[0,T]$ such that the inequality (21) is violated. We define $N = N_0 \cup N_1$. Then from (20) and (21), we see that the set N has measure zero. Now, we define

$$\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon)}(t) & \text{if } t \notin N \\ \mathbf{0} & \text{if } t \in N. \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

Then, we see that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in [0,T]$ and $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) = \mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon)}(t)$ a.e. in $[0,T]$. For $t \notin N$, from (21), we have

$$B(t)\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) = B(t)\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \leq \mathbf{c}(t) + \boldsymbol{\epsilon} + \int_0^t K(t,s)\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon)}(s)ds = \mathbf{c}(t) + \boldsymbol{\epsilon} + \int_0^t K(t,s)\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}(s)ds. \tag{23}$$

This shows that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}$ is a feasible solution of (CLP$_\epsilon$).

To prove part (ii), under the assumptions of $\mathbf{c}(t)$ and $K(t,s)$, it is obvious that the problem (CLP$_\epsilon$) is feasible with the trivial feasible solution $\mathbf{z}(t) = \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in [0,T]$. We consider $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}$ defined in (22). For $t \in N$, we have $B(t)\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) = \mathbf{0}$. Since $\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e. in $[0,T]$ and $K(t_0,s) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e. in $[0,T]$ for each fixed $t_0 \in [0,T]$, we obtain

$$B(t)\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) = \mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{c}(t) + \boldsymbol{\epsilon} + \int_0^t K(t,s)\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon)}(s)ds = \mathbf{c}(t) + \boldsymbol{\epsilon} + \int_0^t K(t,s)\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}(s)ds.$$

By referring to (23) for $t \notin N$, we see that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}(t)$ satisfies all the constraints of primal problem (CLP$_\epsilon$) for all $t \in [0,T]$. This completes the proof. ■

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that $B(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e. in $[0,T]$. For any $\epsilon \geq 0$, the following results hold.*

(i) *Suppose that the problem (CLP$_\epsilon$) is feasible, and that the feasible set $\mathcal{Z}_\epsilon$ of (CLP$_\epsilon$) is uniformly essentially bounded. Then, there exists an optimal solution $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}$ of (CLP$_\epsilon$) such that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in [0,T]$.*

(ii) *Suppose that $\mathbf{c}(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in [0,T]$, $K(t_0,s) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e. in $[0,T]$ for each fixed $t_0 \in [0,T]$, and that the feasible set $\mathcal{Z}_\epsilon$ of (CLP$_\epsilon$) is uniformly essentially bounded. Then, there exists a common optimal solution $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}$ of (CLP$_\epsilon$) and (CLP$_\epsilon^*$) such that both problems have the same optimal objective values.*

Proof. To prove part (i), we define

$$M = \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}_\epsilon} \int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t)\mathbf{z}(t)dt.$$

Then, there exists a sequence $\{\mathbf{z}^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ in $\mathcal{Z}_\epsilon$ such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t)\mathbf{z}^{(k)}(t)dt = M. \tag{24}$$

We are going to claim that the supremum M can be attained by some feasible solution of (CLP$_\epsilon$). Since the sequence $\{\mathbf{z}^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is uniformly essentially bounded in $[0,T]$ by the assumption on the feasible set $\mathcal{Z}_\epsilon$, using part (i) of Proposition 3.3, there exists a subsequence $\{\mathbf{z}^{(k_r)}\}_{r=1}^\infty$ which weakly converges to some feasible solution $\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon)} \in L_q^2[0,T]$ of (CLP$_\epsilon$), and there exists another feasible solution $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}$ of (CLP$_\epsilon$) such that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in [0,T]$ and $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) = \mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon)}(t)$ a.e. in $[0,T]$. From (24), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t)\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}(t)dt &= \int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t)\mathbf{z}^{(\epsilon)}(t)dt = \sum_{j=1}^q \int_0^T z_j^{(\epsilon)}(t)a_j(t)dt \\ &= \lim_{r\to\infty} \sum_{j=1}^q \int_0^T z_j^{(k_r)}(t)a_j(t)dt = \lim_{r\to\infty} \int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t)\mathbf{z}^{(k_r)}(t)dt = M.\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}$ is an optimal solution of (CLP$_\epsilon$).

To prove part (ii), since $\mathbf{c}(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in [0,T]$ and $K(t_0,s) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e. in $[0,T]$ for each fixed $t_0 \in [0,T]$, part (ii) of Proposition 3.3 says that we can take $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}$ as a feasible solution of (CLP$_\epsilon^*$). Since the feasible set of (CLP$_\epsilon^*$) is contained in the feasible set of (CLP$_\epsilon$), it follows that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}$ is an optimal solution of problem (CLP$_\epsilon^*$). This completes the proof. ■

Suppose that there exists a constant $\sigma > 0$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{p} B_{ij}(t) \geq \sigma$ a.e. in $[0,T]$ for each $j = 1, \cdots, q$. We define a real-valued function

$$\rho_\epsilon(t) = \frac{\tau - \epsilon}{\sigma} \cdot \exp\left[\frac{\nu \cdot (T-t)}{\sigma}\right] \text{ for } t \in [0,T] \tag{25}$$

and define $\boldsymbol{\rho}_\epsilon(t)$ as an p-dimensional vector-valued function with all entries $\rho_\epsilon(t)$. In the sequel, we are going to study the existence of optimal solutions of (DCLP$_\epsilon$). We first present the feasibility of dual problem.

Proposition 3.4. *The following statements hold true.*

(i) *Suppose that there exists a constant $\sigma > 0$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{p} B_{ij}(t) \geq \sigma$ a.e. in $[0,T]$ for each $j = 1, \cdots, q$. Then, the problem* (DCLP$_\epsilon$) *is feasible with the feasible solution $\boldsymbol{\rho}_\epsilon$.*

(ii) *Suppose that there exists a constant $\sigma > 0$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{p} B_{ij}(t) \geq \sigma$ for all $t \in [0,T]$ and for each $j = 1, \cdots, q$, and that the function $\sum_{i=1}^{p} K_{ij}$ is bounded by ν and the function a_j is bounded by τ for each $j = 1, \cdots, q$. Then, the problem* (DCLP$^*_\epsilon$) *is feasible with the feasible solution $\boldsymbol{\rho}_\epsilon$.*

Proof. To prove part (i), from (25), we see that

$$\sigma\rho_\epsilon(t) = \tau - \epsilon + \nu \cdot \int_t^T \rho_\epsilon(s)ds \text{ for } t \in [0,T]. \tag{26}$$

For each $j = 1, \cdots, q$, using (26), we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p} B_{ij}(t)\rho_\epsilon(t) \geq \sigma\rho_\epsilon(t) \geq a_j(t) - \epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^{p} \int_t^T K_{ij}(s,t)\rho_\epsilon(s)ds \text{ a.e. in } [0,T]. \tag{27}$$

This shows that $\boldsymbol{\rho}_\epsilon$ is a feasible solution of (DCLP$_\epsilon$). To prove part (ii), by applying the assumptions to (27), we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p} B_{ij}(t)\rho_\epsilon(t) \geq \sigma\rho_\epsilon(t) \geq a_j(t) - \epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^{p} \int_t^T K_{ij}(s,t)\rho_\epsilon(s)ds \text{ for all } t \in [0,T]. \tag{28}$$

This completes the proof. ■

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}$ be a feasible solution of problem* (DCLP$_\epsilon$). *Then, the following statements hold true.*

(i) *There exists a feasible solution $\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}$ of* (DCLP$_\epsilon$) *such that $\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) = \mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(t)$ a.e. in $[0,T]$ and $\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in [0,T]$. If we further assumed that there is a vector-valued function $\mathbf{v}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in [0,T]$ such that $\mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \leq \mathbf{v}^{(\epsilon)}(t)$ a.e. in $[0,T]$, then $\mathbf{0} \leq \bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \leq \mathbf{v}^{(\epsilon)}(t)$ for all $t \in [0,T]$.*

(ii) *Suppose that there exists a constant $\sigma > 0$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{p} B_{ij}(t) \geq \sigma$ for all $t \in [0,T]$ and for each $j = 1, \cdots, q$, and that the function $\sum_{i=1}^{p} K_{ij}$ is bounded by ν and the function a_j is bounded by τ for each $j = 1, \cdots, q$. If $\mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \leq \boldsymbol{\rho}_\epsilon(t)$ a.e. in $[0,T]$, then there exists a feasible solution $\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}$ of* (DCLP$^*_\epsilon$) *such that $\mathbf{0} \leq \bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \leq \boldsymbol{\rho}_\epsilon(t)$ for all $t \in [0,T]$ and $\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) = \mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(t)$ a.e. in $[0,T]$.*

Proof. To prove part (i), we begin by observing that $\mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e in $[0,T]$ and

$$B^\top(t)\mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \geq \mathbf{a}(t) - \boldsymbol{\epsilon} + \int_t^T K^\top(s,t)\mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(s)ds \text{ a.e. in } [0,T]. \tag{29}$$

Let $N_{0i} = \{t \in [0,T] : w_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) < 0\}$ and $N_0 = \bigcup_{i=1}^p N_{0i}$. Let N_1 be the subset of $[0,T]$ on which the inequality (29) is violated, and let $N = N_0 \cup N_1$. Then, we see that the set N has measure zero. Now, we define

$$\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(t) & \text{if } t \notin N \\ \mathbf{0} & \text{if } t \in N. \end{cases}$$

Then, we see that $\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in [0,T]$ and $\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) = \mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(t)$ a.e. in $[0,T]$. For $t \notin N$, from (29), we have

$$\begin{aligned} B^\top(t)\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) &= B^\top(t)\mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \\ &\geq \mathbf{a}(t) - \boldsymbol{\epsilon} + \int_t^T K^\top(s,t)\mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(s)ds = \mathbf{a}(t) - \boldsymbol{\epsilon} + \int_t^T K^\top(s,t)\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(s)ds. \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

This shows that $\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}$ is a feasible solution of the dual problem (DCLP$_\epsilon$).

Now, we assume that $\mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \leq \mathbf{v}^{(\epsilon)}(t)$ a.e. in $[0,T]$. Let N_0 and N_1 be the subsets of $[0,T]$ defined above, $N_{2i} = \{t \in [0,T] : w_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) > v_i^{(\epsilon)}(t)\}$, $N_2 = \bigcup_{i=1}^p N_{2i}$, and $\hat{N} = N_0 \cup N_1 \cup N_2$. Then, the set $\hat{N}$ has measure zero. Now, we define

$$\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(t) & \text{if } t \notin \hat{N} \\ \mathbf{v}^{(\epsilon)}(t) & \text{if } t \in \hat{N}. \end{cases} \tag{31}$$

Then, we see that $\mathbf{0} \leq \bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \leq \mathbf{v}^{(\epsilon)}(t)$ for all $t \in [0,T]$ and $\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) = \mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(t)$ a.e. in $[0,T]$. For $t \notin \hat{N}$, we have $t \notin N$. Using (30), it follows that $\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}$ is a feasible solution of the dual problem (DCLP$_\epsilon$).

To prove part (ii), from (28), we can also obtain the following inequality

$$B^\top(t)\boldsymbol{\rho}_\epsilon(t) \geq \mathbf{a}(t) - \boldsymbol{\epsilon} + \int_t^T K^\top(s,t)\boldsymbol{\rho}_\epsilon(s)ds \text{ for all } t \in [0,T]. \tag{32}$$

We take $\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t)$ as defined in (31) by substituting $\mathbf{v}^{(\epsilon)}$ for $\boldsymbol{\rho}_\epsilon$. Then, we see that $\mathbf{0} \leq \bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \leq \boldsymbol{\rho}_\epsilon(t)$ for all $t \in [0,T]$. For $t \in \hat{N}$, using (32), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} B^\top(t)\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) = B^\top(t)\boldsymbol{\rho}_\epsilon(t) &\geq \mathbf{a}(t) - \boldsymbol{\epsilon} + \int_t^T K^\top(s,t)\boldsymbol{\rho}_\epsilon(s)ds \\ &\geq \mathbf{a}(t) - \boldsymbol{\epsilon} + \int_t^T K^\top(s,t)\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(s)ds. \end{aligned}$$

For $t \notin \hat{N}$, the argument of part (i) is still valid. This shows that $\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}$ satisfies the constraints of (DCLP$_\epsilon$) for all $t \in [0,T]$, and the proof is complete. ■

Lemma 3.5. *$K(t,s) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e. on $[0,T] \times [0,T]$ if and only if the subset*

$$N_K = \{t_0 \in [0,T] : K(s,t_0) \ngeq \mathbf{0} \text{ a.e. on } [0,T]\}$$

has measure zero; that is, for each fixed $t_0 \in [0,T] \setminus N_K$, $K(s,t_0) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e. on $[0,T]$.

Proof. Suppose that $K(t,s) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e. on $[0,T] \times [0,T]$. We are going to prove it by contradiction. Assume that $\mu(N_K) \neq 0$. For each fixed $t_0 \in N_K$, the following set

$$\{s \in [0,T] : K(s,t_0) \geq \mathbf{0}\}$$

has measure zero, which also says that the following set

$$M_{t_0} \equiv \{s \in [0,T] : K(s,t_0) \ngeq \mathbf{0}\}$$

is not measure zero. Let

$$M = \bigcup_{t_0 \in N_K} M_{t_0}.$$

Then, we have $\mu(M) \neq 0$. For each $(t,s) \in M \times N_K$, we see that $K(t,s) \not\geq \mathbf{0}$. Since $(\mu \times \mu)(M \times N_K) = \mu(M) \cdot \mu(N_K) \neq 0$, this contradicts $K(t,s) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e. on $[0,T] \times [0,T]$.

For the converse, let

$$\mathcal{N} = \{(s,t) \in [0,T] \times [0,T] : K(s,t) \not\geq \mathbf{0}\}.$$

Assume that $(\mu \times \mu)(\mathcal{N}) > 0$. We are going to lead to a contradiction. It is well-know that the Lebesgue measure $(\mu \times \mu)(\mathcal{N})$ is equal to the inner measure given by

$$0 < (\mu \times \mu)(\mathcal{N}) = \sup_{(\bigcup_k \mathcal{R}_k) \subseteq \mathcal{N}} \sum_k m(\mathcal{R}_k),$$

where the union is a countable union, each $\mathcal{R}_k$ is a rectangle of $[0,T] \times [0,T]$ and $m(\mathcal{R}_k)$ is the area of the rectangle $\mathcal{R}_k$. Of course, we have $m(\mathcal{R}_k) = (\mu \times \mu)(\mathcal{R}_k)$. In this case, there exists a rectangle $\mathcal{R}_{k_0} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ such that $0 < m(\mathcal{R}_{k_0}) \leq (\mu \times \mu)(\mathcal{N})$. Suppose that $\mathcal{R}_{k_0} = R_{k_0}^{(1)} \times R_{k_0}^{(2)}$, where $R_{k_0}^{(1)}$ and $R_{k_0}^{(2)}$ are intervals in $[0,T]$ such that $\mu(R_{k_0}^{(1)}) \neq 0$ and $\mu(R_{k_0}^{(2)}) \neq 0$. Since $\mu(N_K) = 0$ and $\mu(R_{k_0}^{(2)}) \neq 0$, there exists $t_0^* \in R_{k_0}^{(2)}$ and $t_0^* \notin N_K$ such that $R_{k_0}^{(1)} \times \{t_0^*\} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$. This shows that $K(s,t_0^*) \not\geq \mathbf{0}$ for $(s,t_0^*) \in R_{k_0}^{(1)} \times \{t_0^*\}$, which contradicts $K(s,t_0^*) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e. on $[0,T]$, since $t_0^* \notin N_K$ and $\mu(R_{k_0}^{(1)}) \neq 0$. This completes the proof. ■

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose that the following conditions are satisfied:*

- $K(s,t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ *a.e. in* $[0,T] \times [0,T]$*;*
- $\sum_{i=1}^p B_{ij}(t) > 0$ *a.e. in* $[0,T]$ *for each* $j = 1, \cdots, q$*;*
- *there exists a constant* $\sigma > 0$ *such that, for each* $i = 1, \cdots, p$ *and* $j = 1, \cdots, q$*, the following statement holds true a.e. in* $[0,T]$*:*

$$B_{ij}(t) \neq 0 \text{ implies } B_{ij}(t) \geq \sigma. \tag{33}$$

Consider the vector-valued function $\boldsymbol{\rho}_\epsilon$ *defined in* (25)*, and let* $\mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}$ *be a feasible solution of problem* (DCLP$_\epsilon$)*. Then, there exist a feasible solution* $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}$ *of* (DCLP$_\epsilon$) *such that*

$$\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \geq \mathbf{0} \text{ a.e. in } [0,T] \tag{34}$$

and

$$\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \leq \mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \text{ and } \widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \leq \boldsymbol{\rho}_\epsilon(t) \text{ for all } t \in [0,T]. \tag{35}$$

Moreover, if $\mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}$ *is an optimal solution of* (DCLP$_\epsilon$)*, then* $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}$ *is also an optimal solution of* (DCLP$_\epsilon$)*.*

Proof. Under the assumption of $B(t)$, it is easy to see that $B(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e. in $[0,T]$ and $\sum_{i=1}^p B_{ij}(t) \geq \sigma$ a.e. in $[0,T]$ for each $j = 1, \cdots, q$. Therefore, the dual problem (DCLP$_\epsilon$) is feasible by Proposition 3.4. Since $\mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}$ is a feasible solution of dual problem (DCLP$_\epsilon$), for each $j = 1, \cdots, q$, we have

$$\sum_i B_{ij}(t) w_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) \geq a_j(t) - \epsilon + \sum_i \int_t^T K_{ij}(s,t) w_i^{(\epsilon)}(s) ds \text{ a.e. in } [0,T]. \tag{36}$$

Now, for $t \in [0,T]$, we define

$$\widehat{w}_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) = \min\left\{w_i^{(\epsilon)}(t), \rho_\epsilon(t)\right\}.$$

It is obvious that (34) and (35) are satisfied. On the other hand, from (36) we also obtain

$$\sum_i B_{ij}(t)w_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) \geq a_j(t) - \epsilon + \sum_i \int_t^T K_{ij}(s,t)\widehat{w}_i^{(\epsilon)}(s)ds \text{ a.e. in } [0,T]. \tag{37}$$

Let $\bar{N}_{1i} = \{t \in [0,T] : \widehat{w}_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) < 0\}$ and $\bar{N}_1 = \bigcup_{i=1}^p \bar{N}_{1i}$. Let $\bar{N}_{2ij} = \{t \in [0,T] : B_{ij}(t) < 0\}$ and $\bar{N}_2 = \bigcup_{i=1}^p \bigcup_{j=1}^q \bar{N}_{2ij}$. Let $\bar{N}_3$ be the subset of $[0,T]$ on which the statement (33) is violated. Let

$$\bar{N} = \bar{N}_1 \cup \bar{N}_2 \cup \bar{N}_3 \cup N_K,$$

where N_K is defined in Lemma 3.5. Then $\bar{N}$ has measure zero. Let N_0 and N_1 be the subsets of $[0,T]$ on which the inequalities (27) and (37) are violated, respectively. We take

$$N = N_0 \cup N_1 \cup \bar{N}.$$

Then, the set N has measure zero. For any fixed $t \in [0,T] \setminus N$, we define the index sets $I_{\leq} = \{i : w_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) \leq \rho_\epsilon(t)\}$ and $I_{>} = \{i : w_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) > \rho_\epsilon(t)\}$, and consider

$$\sum_i B_{ij}(t)\widehat{w}_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) = \sum_{i \in I_{\leq}} B_{ij}(t)\widehat{w}_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) + \sum_{i \in I_{>}} B_{ij}(t)\widehat{w}_i^{(\epsilon)}(t).$$

Then, we have the following three cases.

- Suppose that $I_{>} = \emptyset$ (i.e., the second sum is zero). Then, we see that $w_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) = \widehat{w}_i^{(\epsilon)}(t)$ for all i. Therefore, from (37) we have

$$\sum_i B_{ij}(t)\widehat{w}_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) = \sum_i B_{ij}(t)w_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) \geq a_j(t) - \epsilon + \sum_i \int_t^T K_{ij}(s,t)\widehat{w}_i^{(\epsilon)}(s)ds.$$

- Suppose that $I_{>} \neq \emptyset$ and $B_{ij}(t) = 0$ for all $i \in I_{>}$. Then, by (37), we also have

$$\sum_i B_{ij}(t)\widehat{w}_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) = \sum_i B_{ij}(t)w_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) \geq a_j(t) - \epsilon + \sum_i \int_t^T K_{ij}(s,t)\widehat{w}_i^{(\epsilon)}(s)ds.$$

- Suppose that $I_{>} \neq \emptyset$, and that there exists $i_0 \in I_{>}$ with $B_{i_0 j}(t) \neq 0$, i.e., $B_{i_0 j}(t) \geq \sigma$ by the assumption on $B(t)$ (since $t \notin \bar{N}_3$). Since $t \notin \bar{N}_0$ and $t \notin \bar{N}_2$, it follows that $\widehat{w}_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) \geq 0$ and $B_{ij}(t) \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \cdots, p$ and $j = 1, \cdots, q$. Therefore, we have

$$\sum_i B_{ij}(t)\widehat{w}_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) \geq \sum_{i \in I_{>}} B_{ij}(t)\widehat{w}_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) = \sum_{i \in I_{>}} B_{ij}(t)\rho_\epsilon(t) \geq B_{i_0 j}(t)\rho_\epsilon(t) \geq \sigma\rho_\epsilon(t). \tag{38}$$

  Since the fixed $t \notin N_K$, it follows that $K_{ij}(s,t) \geq 0$ a.e. in $[0,T]$ by Lemma 3.5, Since $t \notin N_0$, using (27) and (38), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_i B_{ij}(t)\widehat{w}_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) &\geq a_j(t) - \epsilon + \sum_i \int_t^T K_{ij}(s,t)\rho_\epsilon(s)ds \\ &\geq a_j(t) - \epsilon + \sum_i \int_t^T K_{ij}(s,t)\widehat{w}_i^{(\epsilon)}(s)ds.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$\sum_i B_{ij}(t)\widehat{w}_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) \geq a_j(t) - \epsilon + \sum_i \int_t^T K_{ij}(s,t)\widehat{w}_i^{(\epsilon)}(s)ds \text{ a.e in } [0,T].$$

This shows that $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}$ is a feasible solution of (DCLP_ϵ). Suppose that $\mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}$ is an optimal solution of (DCLP_ϵ). Since (DCLP_ϵ) is a minimization problem and $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \leq \mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(t)$ for all $t \in [0,T]$, we have

$$\int_0^T \left(\mathbf{c}^{(\epsilon)}(t)\right)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t)dt \leq \int_0^T \left(\mathbf{c}^{(\epsilon)}(t)\right)^\top \mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(t)dt \leq \int_0^T \left(\mathbf{c}^{(\epsilon)}(t)\right)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t)dt,$$

which says that $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}$ is an optimal solution of (DCLP_ϵ). This completes the proof. ■

Remark 3.1. We see that if the assumption regarding the time-dependent matrix $B(t)$ in Lemma 3.6 is satisfied, then $\sum_{i=1}^p B_{ij}(t) \geq \sigma$ a.e. in $[0,T]$ for each $j = 1, \cdots, q$, which says that the assumption of Proposition 3.1 regarding the time-dependent matrix $B(t)$ is also satisfied by taking $\lambda_i(t) = 1$ for all $i = 1, \cdots, p$ and $t \in [0,T]$. In other words, the conclusions of Proposition 3.1 are available when the assumption in Lemma 3.6 is satisfied.

Proposition 3.5. *Suppose that the following conditions are satisfied:*

- $K(s,t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ *a.e. in* $[0,T] \times [0,T]$*;*
- $\sum_{i=1}^p B_{ij}(t) > 0$ *a.e. in* $[0,T]$ *for each* $j = 1, \cdots, q$*;*
- *there exists a constant* $\sigma > 0$ *such that, for each* $i = 1, \cdots, p$ *and* $j = 1, \cdots, q$*, the following statement holds true a.e. in* $[0,T]$*:*

$$B_{ij}(t) \neq 0 \text{ implies } B_{ij}(t) \geq \sigma.$$

Consider the sequence $\{\epsilon_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ *with* $\epsilon_k \to 0+$ *as* $k \to \infty$*. For each* ϵ_k*, let* $\mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon_k)}$ *be a feasible solution of problem* $(\mathrm{DCLP}_{\epsilon_k})$*. Then, for each* ϵ_k*, there exists a feasible solution* $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon_k)}$ *of problem* $(\mathrm{DCLP}_{\epsilon_k})$ *such that the following properties hold true.*

(i) *The sequence* $\{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon_k)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ *is uniformly bounded.*

(ii) $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon_k)}(t) \leq \mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon_k)}(t)$ *for all* $t \in [0,T]$ *and, for each* $i = 1, \cdots, p$*,*

$$\widehat{w}_i^{(\epsilon_k)}(t) \geq 0 \text{ a.e. in } [0,T]$$

and

$$\widehat{w}_i^{(\epsilon_k)}(t) \leq \frac{\tau - \epsilon_k}{\sigma} \cdot \exp\left[\frac{\nu \cdot (T-t)}{\sigma}\right] \leq \frac{\tau}{\sigma} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{\nu \cdot T}{\sigma}\right) \text{ for all } t \in [0,T].$$

(iii) *There exists a subsequence* $\{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}\}_{r=1}^\infty$ *which weakly converges to some feasible solution* $\mathbf{w}^{(0)} \in L_p^2[0,T]$ *of problem* $(\mathrm{DCLP}_0) = (\mathrm{DCLP})$*. Moreover, there is also another feasible solution* $\bar{\mathbf{w}}$ *of problem* (DCLP) *such that* $\bar{\mathbf{w}}(t) = \mathbf{w}^{(0)}(t)$ *a.e. in* $[0,T]$ *and, for each* $i = 1, \cdots, p$*,*

$$0 \leq \bar{w}_i(t) \leq \frac{\tau}{\sigma} \cdot \exp\left[\frac{\nu \cdot (T-t)}{\sigma}\right] \leq \frac{\tau}{\sigma} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{\nu \cdot T}{\sigma}\right) \text{ for all } t \in [0,T]. \tag{39}$$

We further assume that the conditions regarding the time-dependent matrix $B(t)$ *are satisfied for all* $t \in [0,T]$*, and that the function* $\sum_{i=1}^p K_{ij}$ *is bounded by* ν *and the function* a_j *is bounded by* τ *for each* $j = 1, \cdots, q$*. Then* $\bar{\mathbf{w}}(t)$ *can be taken as a feasible solution of* (DCLP^*)*.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.6, there exists a sequence $\{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon_k)}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ of feasible solutions of problems ($\mathrm{DCLP}_{\epsilon_k}$) such that $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon_k)}(t) \leq \mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon_k)}(t)$ for all $t \in [0,T]$ and, for each $i = 1, \cdots, p$,

$$\widehat{w}_i^{(\epsilon_k)}(t) \geq 0 \text{ a.e. in } [0,T] \tag{40}$$

and

$$\widehat{w}_i^{(\epsilon_k)}(t) \leq \rho_{\epsilon_k}(t) = \frac{\tau - \epsilon_k}{\sigma} \cdot \exp\left[\frac{\nu \cdot (T-t)}{\sigma}\right] \leq \frac{\tau}{\sigma} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{\nu \cdot T}{\sigma}\right) \text{ for all } t \in [0,T], \tag{41}$$

which says that the sequence $\{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon_k)}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is uniformly bounded in $[0,T]$. This proves parts (i) and (ii). Now, using Lemma 3.2, there exists a subsequence $\{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}\}_{r=1}^{\infty}$ which weakly converges to some $\mathbf{w}^{(0)} \in L_p^2[0,T]$. Using Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\mathbf{0} \leq \liminf_{r\to\infty} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}(t) \leq \mathbf{w}^{(0)}(t) \leq \limsup_{r\to\infty} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}(t) \text{ a.e. in } [0,T]. \tag{42}$$

Since $\{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}\}_{r=1}^{\infty}$ are feasible solutions of problems ($\mathrm{DCLP}_{\epsilon_{k_r}}$), we have

$$B^{\top}(t)\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}(t) \geq \mathbf{a}(t) - \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k_r} + \int_t^T K^{\top}(s,t)\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}(s)ds \text{ a.e. in } [0,T]. \tag{43}$$

By taking the limit inferior and using the weak convergence from (43), since $B(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e. in $[0,T]$, using (42), we obtain

$$B^{\top}(t)\mathbf{w}^{(0)}(t) \geq \liminf_{r\to\infty} B^{\top}(t)\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}(t) \geq \mathbf{a}(t) + \int_t^T K^{\top}(s,t)\mathbf{w}^{(0)}(s)ds \text{ a.e. in } [0,T].$$

This shows that $\mathbf{w}^{(0)}$ is a feasible solution of problem (DCLP). Using (42) and (41), we have

$$0 \leq w_i^{(0)}(t) \leq \frac{\tau}{\sigma} \cdot \exp\left[\frac{\nu \cdot (T-t)}{\sigma}\right] = \rho_0(t) \text{ a.e. in } [0,T] \text{ for each } i = 1, \cdots, p.$$

Using part (i) of Lemma 3.4 by taking $\epsilon = 0$ with $\bar{w}_i \equiv \bar{w}_i^{(0)}$ and

$$v_i^{(0)}(t) \equiv \frac{\tau}{\sigma} \cdot \exp\left[\frac{\nu \cdot (T-t)}{\sigma}\right] = \rho_0(t),$$

we obtain the desired result.

Finally, we further assume that the conditions regarding the time-dependent matrix $B(t)$ are satisfied for all $t \in [0,T]$, and that the function $\sum_{i=1}^{p} K_{ij}$ is bounded by ν and the function a_j is bounded by τ for each $j = 1, \cdots, q$. Then, the desired result follows from part (ii) of Lemma 3.4 by taking $\epsilon = 0$. This completes the proof. ■

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose that the following conditions are satisfied:*

- $K(s,t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ *a.e. in* $[0,T] \times [0,T]$*;*
- $\sum_{i=1}^{p} B_{ij}(t) > 0$ *a.e. in* $[0,T]$ *for each* $j = 1, \cdots, q$*;*
- *there exists a constant* $\sigma > 0$ *such that, for each* $i = 1, \cdots, p$ *and* $j = 1, \cdots, q$*, the following statement holds true a.e. in* $[0,T]$*:*

$$B_{ij}(t) \neq 0 \text{ implies } B_{ij}(t) \geq \sigma.$$

Then, the following results hold.

(i) *The problem* (DCLP_ϵ) *has an optimal solution* $\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}$ *such that, for each* $i = 1, \cdots, p$,

$$0 \le \bar{w}_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) \le \frac{\tau}{\sigma} \cdot \exp\left[\frac{\nu \cdot (T-t)}{\sigma}\right] \le \frac{\tau}{\sigma} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{\nu \cdot T}{\sigma}\right) \text{ for all } t \in [0,T]. \tag{44}$$

(ii) *We further assume that the conditions regarding the time-dependent matrix* $B(t)$ *are satisfied for all* $t \in [0,T]$, *and that the function* $\sum_{i=1}^{p} K_{ij}$ *is bounded by* ν *and the function* a_j *is bounded by* τ *for each* $j = 1, \cdots, q$. *Then, there exists a common optimal solution* $\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}$ *of problems* (DCLP_ϵ) *and* (DCLP_ϵ^*) *such that the inequalities* (44) *are satisfied and both problems have the same optimal objective values.*

Proof. To prove part (i), using Proposition 3.4, we see that problem (DCLP_ϵ) is feasible, i.e., the feasible set $\mathcal{W}_\epsilon$ of problem (DCLP_ϵ) is nonempty. Therefore, if we define

$$M = \inf_{\mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)} \in \mathcal{W}_\epsilon} \int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(t)dt.$$

Then, there exists a sequence $\{\mathbf{w}^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ in $\mathcal{W}_\epsilon$ such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\mathbf{w}^{(k)}(t)dt = M. \tag{45}$$

By Lemma 3.6, there exists a sequence $\{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ of feasible solutions of problems (DCLP_ϵ) such that $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(k)}(t) \le \mathbf{w}^{(k)}(t)$ for all $t \in [0,T]$ and, for each $i = 1, \cdots, p$,

$$\widehat{w}_i^{(k)}(t) \ge 0 \text{ a.e. in } [0,T] \tag{46}$$

and

$$\widehat{w}_i^{(k)}(t) \le \rho_\epsilon(t) = \frac{\tau - \epsilon}{\sigma} \cdot \exp\left[\frac{\nu \cdot (T-t)}{\sigma}\right] \le \frac{\tau}{\sigma} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{\nu \cdot T}{\sigma}\right) \text{ for all } t \in [0,T], \tag{47}$$

which says that the sequence $\{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is uniformly bounded in $[0,T]$. Now, using Lemma 3.2, there exists a subsequence $\{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(k_r)}\}_{r=1}^{\infty}$ which weakly converges to some $\mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)} \in L_p^2[0,T]$. Using Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\mathbf{0} \le \liminf_{r\to\infty} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(k_r)}(t) \le \mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \le \limsup_{r\to\infty} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(k_r)}(t) \text{ a.e. in } [0,T]. \tag{48}$$

Since $\{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(k_r)}\}_{r=1}^{\infty}$ are feasible solutions of problems (DCLP_ϵ), we have

$$B^\top(t)\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(k_r)}(t) \ge \mathbf{a}(t) - \boldsymbol{\epsilon} + \int_t^T K^\top(s,t)\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(k_r)}(s)ds \text{ a.e. in } [0,T]. \tag{49}$$

By taking the limit inferior and using the weak convergence from (49), since $B(t) \ge \mathbf{0}$ a.e. in $[0,T]$, using (48), we obtain

$$B^\top(t)\mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(t) \ge \liminf_{r\to\infty} B^\top(t)\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(k_r)}(t) \ge \mathbf{a}(t) - \boldsymbol{\epsilon} + \int_t^T K^\top(s,t)\mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(s)ds \text{ a.e. in } [0,T].$$

This shows that $\mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}$ is a feasible solution of problem (DCLP_ϵ). Using (48) and (47), we have

$$0 \le w_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) \le \frac{\tau}{\sigma} \cdot \exp\left[\frac{\nu \cdot (T-t)}{\sigma}\right] \text{ a.e. in } [0,T] \text{ for each } i = 1, \cdots, p.$$

Using part (i) of Lemma 3.4 by taking

$$v_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) \equiv \frac{\tau}{\sigma} \cdot \exp\left[\frac{\nu \cdot (T-t)}{\sigma}\right],$$

we obtain $\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) = \mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(t)$ a.e. in $[0,T]$ for some feasible solution $\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}$ of problem (DCLP$_\epsilon$) satisfying (44). Therefore, using the weak convergence, we have

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t)dt = \int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(t)dt = \lim_{r\to\infty}\int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(k_r)}(t)dt$$
$$\leq \lim_{r\to\infty}\int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\mathbf{w}^{(k_r)}(t)dt = M.$$

Since $\{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(k_r)}\}_{r=1}^\infty$ are feasible solutions of the minimization problem (DCLP$_\epsilon$), we have

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t)dt = \int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\mathbf{w}^{(\epsilon)}(t)dt = \lim_{r\to\infty}\int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(k_r)}(t)dt \geq M.$$

This shows that $\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}$ is an optimal solution of problem (DCLP$_\epsilon$) such that the inequalities (44) are satisfied.

To prove part (ii), under the further assumptions, using part (ii) of Lemma 3.4, we can see that $\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}$ is also a feasible solution of (DCLP$_\epsilon^*$). Since the feasible set of (DCLP$_\epsilon^*$) is contained in the feasible set of (DCLP$_\epsilon$), we conclude that $\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}$ is also an optimal solution of (DCLP$_\epsilon^*$). This completes the proof. ■

4 Discretized Problems

Now, we are going to consider the discretized versions of problems (CLP) and (DCLP). Let us consider the Lebesgue measure μ on $[0,T]$. Then, we have $\mu([0,T]) = T$. According to the constraints of problems (CLP) and (DCLP), we see that there is a subset $\mathcal{T}$ of $[0,T]$ such that all the constraints of (CLP) and (DCLP) are satisfied for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\mu(\mathcal{T}) = T$. Let

$$\mathcal{P} = \{0 = t_0, t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_N = T\}$$

be a partition of $[0,T]$ such that $t_u \in \mathcal{T}$ for all $u = 1, \cdots, N-1$. In this case, all the constraints of (CLP) and (DCLP) are satisfied for all $t \in \mathcal{P}$.

Remark 4.1. Suppose that some conditions are satisfied a.e. in $[0,T]$. We can also construct a subset $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ of $[0,T]$ such that $\mu(\hat{\mathcal{T}}) = T$ and define a new partition $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ of $[0,T]$ such that these conditions are satisfied for all $t \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}$. For example, some of these conditions are listed below:

- the essential boundedness shown in (4)-(8);
- $\mathbf{c}(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e in $[0,T]$;
- $K(t,s) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e. on $[0,T]\times[0,T]$;
- there exists a constant $\sigma > 0$ such that, for each $i = 1, \cdots, p$ and $j = 1, \cdots, q$, the following statement holds true a.e. in $[0,T]$:

$$B_{ij}(t) \neq 0 \text{ implies } B_{ij}(t) \geq \sigma;$$

- there exist real-valued functions λ_i satisfying $0 \leq \lambda_i(t) \leq 1$ a.e. in $[0,T]$ for $i = 1, \cdots, p$ and a constant $\sigma > 0$ satisfying

$$\min_{j=1,\cdots,q}\left\{\sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i(t)B_{ij}(t)\right\} \geq \sigma \text{ a.e. in } [0,T].$$

Recall that f is piecewise continuous on $[0,T]$ means that f is continuous on $[0,T]$ except for a finite subset of $[0,T]$. Let H be a real-valued function define on $[0,T]\times[0,T]$. We consider the piecewise continuity for H in the following sense: there is a partition $\mathcal{P}_H=\{0=t_0,t_1,t_2,\cdots,t_M=T\}$ on $[0,T]$ such that the following conditions are satisfied:

- $H(s,t)$ is continuous on the open rectangles $(t_{u-1},t_u)\times(t_{v-1},t_v)$ for $u=1,\cdots,M$ and $v=1,\cdots,M$;
- for any fixed $s\notin\mathcal{P}_H$, the single-variable function $H(s,\cdot)$ is continuous on the open intervals (t_{v-1},t_v) for $v=1,\cdots,M$;
- for any fixed $t\notin\mathcal{P}_H$, the single-variable function $H(\cdot,t)$ is continuous on the open intervals (t_{u-1},t_u) for $u=1,\cdots,M$.

In order to prove the strong duality theorem, we assume further that each entry of $\mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{c}$, B and K is piecewise continuous on $[0,T]$ and $[0,T]\times[0,T]$, respectively; that is, a_j, c_i, B_{ij} and K_{ij} are piecewise continuous on $[0,T]$ and $[0,T]\times[0,T]$, respectively, for each $i=1,\cdots,p$ and $j=1,\cdots,q$.

Under the above assumptions, we can take the partition $\mathcal{P}$ such that all the discontinuities of a_j, c_i, B_{ij} and K_{ij} are contained in $\mathcal{P}$. In this case, each a_j, c_i, B_{ij} and K_{ij} is continuous on the open subintervals (t_{u-1},t_u) and open rectangles $(t_{u-1},t_u)\times(t_{v-1},t_v)$ for $u=1,\cdots,N$ and $v=1,\cdots,N$, respectively.

Given a partition $\mathcal{P}=\{t_0,t_1,\cdots,t_N\}$ of $[0,T]$, let

$$\parallel\mathcal{P}\parallel=\max_{u=1,\cdots,N}(t_u-t_{u-1})\ \text{ satisfying }\lim_{N\to\infty}\parallel\mathcal{P}\parallel=0.$$

According to the above construction, we assume that the partition $\mathcal{P}$ satisfies the following conditions.

- The value $\parallel\mathcal{P}\parallel$ can be sufficiently small such that there is a fixed constant $\kappa\geq 1$ satisfying

$$\parallel\mathcal{P}\parallel\leq\kappa T/N. \tag{50}$$

- All the constraints of (CLP) and (DCLP) are satisfied for all $t\in\mathcal{P}$.
- All the assumptions regarding the functions a_j, c_i, B_{ij} and K_{ij} are satisfied for all $t\in\mathcal{P}$.
- All the discontinuities of a_j, c_i, B_{ij} and K_{ij} are contained in $\mathcal{P}$.
- Remark 4.1 is taken into account.

Given a partition $\mathcal{P}$ satisfying the above assumptions, since each entry of $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{c}$ is piecewise continuous on $[0,T]$, i.e., each entry of $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{c}$ is continuous on each open interval (t_{u-1},t_u) for $u=1,\cdots,N$, we define

$$a_j^{(u)}=\inf_{t\in(t_{u-1},t_u)}a_j(t)>-\infty\text{ and }c_i^{(u)}=\inf_{t\in(t_{u-1},t_u)}c_i(t)>-\infty. \tag{51}$$

Then, by Remark 4.1, we see that

$$\tau\geq a_j^{(u)}\text{ and }\zeta\geq c_i^{(u)}. \tag{52}$$

Now, we define the vectors $\mathbf{a}^{(u)}$ and $\mathbf{c}^{(u)}$ that are consisting of $a_j^{(u)}$ and $c_i^{(u)}$ for $j=1,\cdots,q$ and $i=1,\cdots,p$, respectively.

Since each entry of the time-dependent matrices B and K is piecewise continuous on $[0,T]$ and $[0,T]\times[0,T]$, respectively, for $u=1,\cdots,N$, we define

$$B_{ij}^{(u)}=\sup_{t\in(t_{u-1},t_u)}B_{ij}(t)<+\infty\text{ and }K_{ij}^{(u,v)}=\inf_{(t,s)\in(t_{u-1},t_u)\times(t_{v-1},t_v)}K_{ij}(t,s)>-\infty. \tag{53}$$

Then, by (6), (7) and Remark 4.1, we see that

$$K_{ij}^{(u,v)} \le \eta \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^{p} K_{ij}^{(u,v)} \le \nu \tag{54}$$

We also define the matrices $B^{(u)}$ and $K^{(u,v)}$ that are consisting of $B_{ij}^{(u)}$ and $K_{ij}^{(u,v)}$ for $j = 1, \cdots, q$ and $i = 1, \cdots, p$, respectively.

Let $\mathbf{z}^{(u)}$ and $\mathbf{w}^{(u)}$ be the q-dimensional and p-dimensional vectors, respectively. We consider the following finite-dimensional linear programming problems:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathrm{LP}^{(N)}) \qquad \max \quad & \sum_{u=1}^{N} (t_u - t_{u-1}) \, (\mathbf{a}^{(u)})^\top \mathbf{z}^{(u)} \\
\text{subject to} \quad & B^{(1)} \mathbf{z}^{(1)} \le \mathbf{c}^{(1)} \\
& B^{(u)} \mathbf{z}^{(u)} \le \mathbf{c}^{(u)} + \sum_{v=1}^{u-1} (t_v - t_{v-1}) \, K^{(u,v)} \mathbf{z}^{(v)} \text{ for } u = 2, \cdots, N \qquad (55) \\
& \mathbf{z}^{(u)} \ge \mathbf{0} \text{ for } u = 1, \cdots, N.
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathrm{DLP}^{(*N)}) \qquad \min \quad & \sum_{u=1}^{N} (\mathbf{c}^{(u)})^\top \widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(u)} \\
\text{subject to} \quad & (B^{(u)})^\top \widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(u)} \ge (t_u - t_{u-1}) \, \mathbf{a}^{(u)} \\
& \qquad + (t_u - t_{u-1}) \sum_{v=u+1}^{N} (K^{(v,u)})^\top \widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(v)} \text{ for } u = 1, \cdots, N-1 \\
& (B^{(N)})^\top \widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(N)} \ge (t_N - t_{N-1}) \, \mathbf{a}^{(N)} \\
& \widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(u)} \ge \mathbf{0} \text{ for } u = 1, \cdots, N.
\end{aligned}$$

Based on the following matrices

$$A\mathbf{z} = \begin{bmatrix}
B^{(1)} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\
-(t_1 - t_0) K^{(2,1)} & B^{(2)} & & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\
-(t_1 - t_0) K^{(3,1)} & -(t_2 - t_1) K^{(3,2)} & B^{(3)} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
-(t_1 - t_0) K^{(N,1)} & -(t_2 - t_1) K^{(N,2)} & \cdots & -(t_N - t_{N-1}) K^{(N,N-1)} & B^{(N)}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{z}^{(1)} \\ \mathbf{z}^{(2)} \\ \mathbf{z}^{(3)} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{z}^{(N)} \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$A^\top \widehat{\mathbf{w}} = \begin{bmatrix}
B^{(1)} & -(t_1 - t_0) K^{(2,1)} & -(t_1 - t_0) K^{(3,1)} & \cdots & -(t_1 - t_0) K^{(N,1)} \\
\mathbf{0} & B^{(2)} & -(t_2 - t_1) K^{(3,2)} & \cdots & -(t_2 - t_1) K^{(N,2)} \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & B^{(3)} & \cdots & -(t_3 - t_2) K^{(N,3)} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} & -(t_N - t_{N-1}) K^{(N,N-1)} \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} & B^{(N)}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(1)} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(2)} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(3)} \\ \vdots \\ \widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(N-1)} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(N)} \end{bmatrix},$$

we see that $(\mathrm{LP}^{(N)})$ and $(\mathrm{DLP}^{(*N)})$ are finite-dimensional primal and dual pair of linear programming problems. Now, let

$$\mathbf{w}^{(u)} = \left(\frac{1}{t_u - t_{u-1}} \right) \widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(u)}.$$

Then, by dividing $t_u - t_{u-1}$ on both sides of the constraints of dual problem $(\mathrm{DLP}^{(*N)})$, we obtain the following equivalent problem

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathrm{DLP}^{(N)}) \qquad \min \quad & \sum_{u=1}^{N} (t_u - t_{u-1}) \, (\mathbf{c}^{(u)})^\top \mathbf{w}^{(u)} \\ \text{subject to} \quad & (B^{(u)})^\top \mathbf{w}^{(u)} \geq \mathbf{a}^{(u)} \\ & \quad + \sum_{v=u+1}^{N} (t_v - t_{v-1}) \, (K^{(v,u)})^\top \mathbf{w}^{(v)} \text{ for } u = 1, \cdots, N-1 \qquad (56) \\ & (B^{(N)})^\top \mathbf{w}^{(N)} \geq \mathbf{a}^{(N)} \\ & \mathbf{w}^{(u)} \geq \mathbf{0} \text{ for } u = 1, \cdots, N.\end{aligned}$$

In the sequel, we shall use this equivalent dual problem $(\mathrm{DLP}^{(N)})$.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that each entry of* $\mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{c}$, B *and* K *is piecewise continuous on* $[0,T]$ *and* $[0,T] \times [0,T]$, *respectively. The following statements hold true.*

(i) *If* $\mathbf{c}(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ *a.e. in* $[0,T]$, *then the primal problem* $(\mathrm{LP}^{(N)})$ *is feasible.*

(ii) *Suppose that* $\sum_{i=1}^{p} B_{ij}(t) > 0$ *a.e. in* $[0,T]$ *for each* $j = 1, \cdots, q$, *and that there exists a constant* $\sigma > 0$ *such that, for each* $i = 1, \cdots, p$ *and* $j = 1, \cdots, q$, *the following statement holds true a.e. in* $[0,T]$*:*

$$B_{ij}(t) \neq 0 \text{ implies } B_{ij}(t) \geq \sigma. \qquad (57)$$

Given a partition $\mathcal{P} = \{t_0, t_1, \cdots, t_N\}$ *of* $[0,T]$, *let*

$$\mathfrak{w}_u = \frac{\tau}{\sigma} \cdot \left(1 + \parallel \mathcal{P} \parallel \cdot \frac{\nu}{\sigma}\right)^{N-u} \text{ for } u = 1, \cdots, N. \qquad (58)$$

We define the vector $\mathbf{w}^{(u)}$ *with all entries* $\mathfrak{w}_u$ *for* $u = 1, \cdots, N$. *Then,* $(\mathbf{w}^{(1)}, \cdots, \mathbf{w}^{(N)})$ *is a feasible solution of problem* $(\mathrm{DLP}^{(N)})$*; that is, the dual problem* $(\mathrm{DLP}^{(N)})$ *is feasible. In other words, the strong duality theorem holds true between problems* $(\mathrm{LP}^{(N)})$ *and* $(\mathrm{DLP}^{(N)})$.

Proof. To prove part (i), since each entry of $\mathbf{c}$ is piecewise continuous on $[0,T]$, according to the construction of partition $\mathcal{P}$, each entry c_i is continuous on the open subinterval (t_{u-1}, t_u) for $u = 1, \cdots, N$. Since $c_i(t) \geq 0$ a.e. on (t_{u-1}, t_u), it follows that $c_i(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \in (t_{u-1}, t_u)$ by the continuity. From (51), we see that $\mathbf{c}^{(u)} \geq \mathbf{0}$ for all $u = 1, \cdots, N$. It is obvious that the primal problem $(\mathrm{LP}^{(N)})$ is feasible with the trivial feasible solution $\mathbf{z}^{(u)} = \mathbf{0}$ for $u = 1, \cdots, N$.

To prove part (ii), for each $j = 1, \cdots, q$, since the measure of open interval (t_{u-1}, t_u) is not zero, using the assumption for B and referring to (53), there exists $t^* \in (t_{u-1}, t_u)$ such that $0 \leq B_{ij}(t^*) \leq B_{ij}^{(u)}$ for each $i = 1, \cdots, p$, $\sum_{i=1}^{p} B_{ij}(t^*) > 0$ and the statement (57) is satisfied at t^*. Therefore, there exists $i_j \in \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$ such that $B_{i_j j}(t^*) > 0$, which implies

$$B_{i_j j}^{(u)} \geq B_{i_j j}(t^*) \geq \sigma > 0.$$

Since $B_{ij}^{(u)} \geq 0$ and $w_i^{(u)} = \mathfrak{w}_u \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \cdots, p$ and $u = 1, \cdots, N$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p} B_{ij}^{(u)} \cdot w_i^{(u)} \geq B_{i_j j}^{(u)} \cdot w_{i_j}^{(u)} = B_{i_j j}^{(u)} \cdot \frac{\tau}{\sigma} \cdot \left(1 + \parallel \mathcal{P} \parallel \cdot \frac{\nu}{\sigma}\right)^{N-u} \geq \tau \cdot \left(1 + \parallel \mathcal{P} \parallel \cdot \frac{\nu}{\sigma}\right)^{N-u}. \qquad (59)$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{p} (t_v - t_{v-1}) \cdot K_{ij}^{(v,u)} \cdot w_i^{(v)} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{p} \parallel \mathcal{P} \parallel \cdot K_{ij}^{(v,u)} \cdot \frac{\tau}{\sigma} \cdot \left(1 + \parallel \mathcal{P} \parallel \cdot \frac{\nu}{\sigma}\right)^{N-v} \\ &\leq \parallel \mathcal{P} \parallel \cdot \frac{\nu \cdot \tau}{\sigma} \left(1 + \parallel \mathcal{P} \parallel \cdot \frac{\nu}{\sigma}\right)^{N-v} \text{ (by (54))},\end{aligned}$$

it follows that, for $u = 1, \cdots, N-1$,

$$a_j^{(u)} + \sum_{i=1}^{p} \left[\sum_{v=u+1}^{N} (t_v - t_{v-1}) \cdot K_{ij}^{(v,u)} \cdot w_i^{(v)} \right] = a_j^{(u)} + \sum_{v=u+1}^{N} \sum_{i=1}^{p} (t_v - t_{v-1}) \cdot K_{ij}^{(v,u)} \cdot w_i^{(v)}$$

$$\leq \tau + \sum_{v=u+1}^{N} \parallel \mathcal{P} \parallel \cdot \frac{\nu \cdot \tau}{\sigma} \left(1 + \parallel \mathcal{P} \parallel \cdot \frac{\nu}{\sigma}\right)^{N-v}$$

$$= \tau \cdot \left[1 + \sum_{v=u+1}^{N} \parallel \mathcal{P} \parallel \cdot \frac{\nu}{\sigma} \cdot \left(1 + \parallel \mathcal{P} \parallel \cdot \frac{\nu}{\sigma}\right)^{N-v} \right] = \tau \cdot \left(1 + \parallel \mathcal{P} \parallel \cdot \frac{\nu}{\sigma}\right)^{N-u}. \tag{60}$$

Therefore, from (59) and (52), we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p} B_{ij}^{(u)} \cdot w_i^{(u)} \geq a_j^{(u)} + \sum_{i=1}^{p} \sum_{v=u+1}^{N} (t_v - t_{v-1}) \cdot K_{ij}^{(v,u)} \cdot w_i^{(v)} \text{ for } u = 1, \cdots, N-1$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p} B_{ij}^{(N)} \cdot w_i^{(N)} \geq \tau \geq a_j^{(N)}.$$

This completes the proof. ■

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that the set* $\{x_1, \cdots, x_N\}$ *satisfies*

$$x_1 \leq \theta_1 \text{ and } x_u \leq \theta_1 + \theta_2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{u-1} x_i \text{ for } u = 2, \cdots, N.$$

Then $x_u \leq \theta_1 \cdot (1 + \theta_2)^{u-1}$ *for* $u = 1, \cdots, N$.

Proof. We are going to prove it by induction. For $u = 1$, it is obviously true. Suppose that $x_u \leq \theta_1 (1 + \theta_2)^{u-1}$ hold true for $u = 2, \cdots, N-1$. Then, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} x_i \leq \theta_1 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} (1 + \theta_2)^{i-1} = \frac{\theta_1 \left[(1 + \theta_2)^{N-1} - 1\right]}{\theta_2}.$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$x_N \leq \theta_1 + \theta_2 \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} x_i \leq \theta_1 + \theta_2 \cdot \frac{\theta_1 \left[(1 + \theta_2)^{N-1} - 1\right]}{\theta_2} = \theta_1 (1 + \theta_2)^{N-1}.$$

This completes the proof. ■

Proposition 4.2. *Suppose that each entry of* $\mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{c}$, B *and* K *is piecewise continuous on* $[0, T]$ *and* $[0, T] \times [0, T]$, *respectively, and that there exist real-valued functions* λ_i *satisfying* $0 \leq \lambda_i(t) \leq 1$ *a.e. in* $[0, T]$ *for* $i = 1, \cdots, p$, *and a constant* $\sigma > 0$ *such that*

$$\min_{j=1,\cdots,q} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{p} \lambda_i(t) B_{ij}(t) \right\} \geq \sigma \text{ a.e. in } [0, T]. \tag{61}$$

If $(\mathbf{z}^{(1)}, \cdots, \mathbf{z}^{(N)})$ *is a feasible solution of primal problem* $(\mathrm{LP}^{(N)})$, *then*

$$\parallel \mathbf{z}^{(1)} \parallel \leq \frac{n\zeta}{\sigma} \text{ and } \parallel \mathbf{z}^{(u)} \parallel \leq \frac{n\zeta}{\sigma} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{n\nu\kappa T}{\sigma}\right) \tag{62}$$

for $u = 2, \cdots, N$. *In other words, the bound for the feasible solutions is independent of the partition* $\mathcal{P}$.

Proof. For $u = 1, \cdots, N$, we define

$$\lambda_i^{(u)} = \operatorname{ess}\sup_{t\in[t_{u-1},t_u]} |\lambda_i(t)| = \inf\{k : |\lambda_i(t)| \le k \text{ a.e. in } [t_{u-1}, t_u]\}.$$

Since $0 \le \lambda_i(t) \le 1$ a.e. in $[0, T]$ for $i = 1, \cdots, p$ by the assumption, it follows that

$$0 \le \lambda_i(t) \le \lambda_i^{(u)} \text{ a.e. in } [t_{u-1}, t_u] \tag{63}$$

and $0 \le \lambda_i^{(u)} \le 1$ for all $i = 1, \cdots, p$ and $u = 1, \cdots, N$. Since $\sum_{j=1}^q B_{ij}^{(1)} z_j^{(1)} \le c_i^{(1)}$ by the feasibility, multiplying $\lambda_i^{(1)} \ge 0$ on both sides, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^q B_{ij}^{(1)} \lambda_i^{(1)} z_j^{(1)} \le \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i^{(1)} c_i^{(1)}. \tag{64}$$

From (53), (61) and (63), we have

$$\min_{j=1,\cdots,q} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i^{(u)} B_{ij}^{(u)} \right\} \ge \min_{j=1,\cdots,q} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i(t) B_{ij}(t) \right\} \ge \sigma \text{ a.e. in } [t_{u-1}, t_u]. \tag{65}$$

Using (64), (65) and (52), we obtain

$$\sigma \cdot \parallel \mathbf{z}^{(1)} \parallel = \sum_{j=1}^q \sigma \cdot z_j^{(1)} \le \sum_{j=1}^q \left[z_j^{(1)} \sum_{i=1}^p B_{ij}^{(1)} \lambda_i^{(1)} \right] \le \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i^{(1)} c_i^{(1)} \le \sum_{i=1}^p c_i^{(1)} \le n\zeta.$$

This shows that

$$\parallel \mathbf{z}^{(1)} \parallel \le \frac{n\zeta}{\sigma}. \tag{66}$$

From (55), for each $u = 2, \cdots, N$ and $i = 1, \cdots, p$, since $\lambda_i^{(u)} \ge 0$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^q B_{ij}^{(u)} \lambda_i^{(u)} z_j^{(u)} \le \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_i^{(u)} c_i^{(u)} + \sum_{v=1}^{u-1} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^q (t_v - t_{v-1}) K_{ij}^{(u,v)} \lambda_i^{(u)} z_j^{(v)}. \tag{67}$$

Since $0 \le \lambda_i^{(u)} \le 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma \cdot \parallel \mathbf{z}^{(u)} \parallel &= \sum_{j=1}^q \sigma \cdot z_j^{(u)} \le \sum_{j=1}^q \left[z_j^{(u)} \sum_{i=1}^p B_{ij}^{(u)} \lambda_i^{(u)} \right] \text{ (by (65))} \\ &\le n\zeta + n\nu \parallel \mathcal{P} \parallel \cdot \sum_{v=1}^{u-1} \parallel \mathbf{z}^{(v)} \parallel \text{ (by (67), (7) and (53)).} \end{aligned}$$

Let $\theta_1 = n\zeta/\sigma$ and $\theta_2 = n\nu \parallel \mathcal{P} \parallel /\sigma$. We have $\parallel \mathbf{z}^{(1)} \parallel \le \theta_1$ by (66) and

$$\parallel \mathbf{z}^{(u)} \parallel \le \theta_1 + \theta_2 \cdot \sum_{v=1}^{u-1} \parallel \mathbf{z}^{(v)} \parallel \text{ for } u = 2, \cdots, N.$$

According to Lemma 4.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \parallel \mathbf{z}^{(u)} \parallel &\le \theta_1 (1+\theta_2)^{u-1} \le \theta_1 (1+\theta_2)^N \\ &\le \theta_1 \cdot \exp(\theta_2 N) \text{ (using the fact of } e^t \ge 1 + t) \\ &= \frac{n\zeta}{\sigma} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{n\nu N \parallel \mathcal{P} \parallel}{\sigma} \right) \le \frac{n\zeta}{\sigma} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{n\nu\kappa T}{\sigma} \right) \text{ (using (50))} \end{aligned}$$

for $u = 2, \cdots, N$. This completes the proof. ■

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose that each entry of* $\mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{c}$, B *and* K *is piecewise continuous on* $[0,T]$ *and* $[0,T]\times[0,T]$, *respectively, and that there exists a constant* $\sigma>0$ *such that, for each* $i=1,\cdots,p$ *and* $j=1,\cdots,q$, *the following statement holds true a.e. in* $[0,T]$*:*

$$B_{ij}(t)\neq 0 \text{ implies } B_{ij}(t)\geq\sigma.$$

If $(\mathbf{d}^{(1)},\cdots,\mathbf{d}^{(N)})$ *is a feasible solution of dual problem* $(\mathrm{DLP}^{(N)})$, *then there exists a feasible solution* $(\mathbf{w}^{(1)},\cdots,\mathbf{w}^{(N)})$ *of dual problem* $(\mathrm{DLP}^{(N)})$ *such that*

$$\mathbf{w}^{(u)}\leq\mathbf{d}^{(u)} \text{ and } 0\leq w_i^{(u)}\leq\frac{\tau}{\sigma}\cdot\exp\left(\frac{\eta T}{\sigma}\right) \tag{68}$$

for $u=1,\cdots,N$ *and* $i=1,\cdots,p$, *where the bound of feasible solutions is independent of the partition* $\|\mathcal{P}\|$. *Moreover, if* $(\mathbf{d}^{(1)},\cdots,\mathbf{d}^{(N)})$ *is an optimal solution of dual problem* $(\mathrm{DLP}^{(N)})$, *then* $(\mathbf{w}^{(1)},\cdots,\mathbf{w}^{(N)})$ *is also an optimal solution of dual problem* $(\mathrm{DLP}^{(N)})$.

Proof. Let

$$\rho(t)=\frac{\tau}{\sigma}\cdot\exp\left[\frac{\eta(T-t)}{\sigma}\right]. \tag{69}$$

Then, we have

$$\sigma\rho(t)=\tau+\eta\cdot\int_t^T\rho(s)ds. \tag{70}$$

From (69), for $u=1,\cdots,N$, we define

$$\rho_u=\rho(t_u)=\frac{\tau}{\sigma}\cdot\exp\left[\frac{\eta(T-t_u)}{\sigma}\right].$$

By taking $t=t_u$ in (70), since ρ is a decreasing function, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma\rho_u&=\tau+\eta\cdot\int_{t_u}^T\rho(s)ds=\tau+\eta\cdot\sum_{v=u}^{N-1}\int_{t_v}^{t_{v+1}}\rho(s)ds\geq\tau+\eta\cdot\sum_{v=u}^{N-1}\int_{t_v}^{t_{v+1}}\rho(t_{v+1})ds\\&\geq a_j^{(u)}+\sum_{v=u+1}^{N}(t_v-t_{v-1})K_{ij}^{(v,u)}\rho_v \text{ (by (54) and (52))}.\end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

According to constraint (56), for $j=1,\cdots,q$ and $u=1,\cdots,N-1$, we have

$$\sum_i B_{ij}^{(u)}d_i^{(u)}\geq a_j^{(u)}+\sum_{v=u+1}^{N}(t_v-t_{v-1})K_{ij}^{(v,u)}d_i^{(v)}. \tag{72}$$

For $u=1,\cdots,N$, we define $w_i^{(u)}=\min\{d_i^{(u)},\rho_u\}$. Since $K_{ij}^{(v,u)}\geq 0$, from (72), we obtain

$$\sum_i B_{ij}^{(u)}d_i^{(u)}\geq a_j^{(u)}+\sum_{u=v+1}^{N}(t_v-t_{v-1})K_{ij}^{(v,u)}w_i^{(v)}. \tag{73}$$

For each fixed u, we define the index sets $I_{\leq}=\{i:d_i^{(u)}\leq\rho_u\}$ and $I_{>}=\{i:d_i^{(u)}>\rho_u\}$ and consider

$$\sum_i B_{ij}^{(u)}w_i^{(u)}=\sum_{i\in I_{\leq}}B_{ij}^{(u)}w_i^{(u)}+\sum_{i\in I_{>}}B_{ij}^{(u)}w_i^{(u)}.$$

Then, we have the following three cases.

- Suppose that $I_> = \emptyset$ (i.e., the second sum is zero). Then, we see that $d_i^{(u)} = w_i^{(u)}$ for all i. Therefore, from (73), we have

$$\sum_i B_{ij}^{(u)} w_i^{(u)} = \sum_i B_{ij}^{(u)} d_i^{(u)} \geq a_j^{(u)} + \sum_{u=v+1}^{N} (t_v - t_{v-1}) K_{ij}^{(v,u)} w_i^{(v)}.$$

- Suppose that $I_> \neq \emptyset$ and $B_{ij}^{(u)} = 0$ for all $i \in I_>$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_i B_{ij}^{(u)} w_i^{(u)} &= \sum_{i \in I_\leq} B_{ij}^{(u)} d_i^{(u)} + \sum_{i \in I_>} B_{ij}^{(u)} \rho_u \\ &= \sum_{i \in I_\leq} B_{ij}^{(u)} d_i^{(u)} + \sum_{i \in I_>} B_{ij}^{(u)} d_i^{(u)} = \sum_i B_{ij}^{(u)} d_i^{(u)} \\ &\geq a_j^{(u)} + \sum_{u=v+1}^{N} (t_v - t_{v-1}) K_{ij}^{(v,u)} w_i^{(v)} \text{ (by (73))}.\end{aligned}$$

- Suppose that $I_> \neq \emptyset$, and that there exists $i^* \in I_>$ with $B_{i^*j}^{(u)} \neq 0$. Then, by the definition of $B_{i^*j}^{(u)}$, there exists $t^* \in (t_{u-1}, t_u)$ such that $B_{i^*j}(t^*) \neq 0$. Since $B_{i^*j}(t) \geq 0$ a.e. in $[t_{u-1}, t_u]$ and B_{i^*j} is continuous on (t_{u-1}, t_u), we must have $B_{i^*j}(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \in (t_{u-1}, t_u)$. The facts of $B_{i^*j}(t^*) \neq 0$ and the continuity of B_{i^*j} on (t_{u-1}, t_u) imply that there exists a subset T_u of (t_{u-1}, t_u) with nonzero measure such that $B_{i^*j}(t) > 0$ on T_u. By the assumption of B, we also have $B_{i^*j}(t) \geq \sigma$ a.e. in T_u. Since $B_{i^*j}(t) \leq B_{i^*j}^{(u)}$ for all $t \in (t_{u-1}, t_u)$, we conclude that $B_{i^*j}^{(u)} \geq \sigma$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_i B_{ij}^{(u)} w_i^{(u)} &\geq \sum_{i \in I_>} B_{ij}^{(u)} w_i^{(u)} = \sum_{i \in I_>} B_{ij}^{(u)} \rho_u \geq B_{i^*j}^{(u)} \rho_u \geq \sigma \rho_u \\ &\geq a_j^{(u)} + \sum_{u=v+1}^{N} (t_v - t_{v-1}) K_{ij}^{(v,u)} w_i^{(v)} \text{ (by (71) and } \rho_v \geq w_i^{(v)} \geq 0).\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $(\mathbf{w}^{(1)}, \cdots, \mathbf{w}^{(N)})$ is a feasible solution of dual problem (DLP$^{(N)}$). Since $w_i^{(u)} \leq \rho_u$ for $u = 1, \cdots, N$, we also obtain (68). Finally, since $\mathbf{w}^{(u)} \leq \mathbf{d}^{(u)}$ for $v = 1, \cdots, N$, if $(\mathbf{d}^{(1)}, \cdots, \mathbf{d}^{(N)})$ is an optimal solution of problem (DLP$^{(N)}$), then, considering the objective values, we have

$$\sum_{u=1}^{N} (t_u - t_{u-1}) (\mathbf{c}^{(u)})^\top \mathbf{d}^{(u)} \leq \sum_{u=1}^{N} (t_u - t_{u-1}) (\mathbf{c}^{(u)})^\top \mathbf{w}^{(u)} \leq \sum_{u=1}^{N} (t_u - t_{u-1}) (\mathbf{c}^{(u)})^\top \mathbf{d}^{(u)},$$

which says that $(\mathbf{w}^{(1)}, \cdots, \mathbf{w}^{(N)})$ is also an optimal solution of problem (DLP$^{(N)}$). This completes the proof. ■

5 Strong Duality Theorem

Let $\mathbf{z}^{(u)} = (z_1^{(u)}, \cdots, z_q^{(u)})$ for $u = 1, \cdots, N$ be feasible solutions of primal problem (LP$^{(N)}$) with the corresponding partition $\mathcal{P} = \{0 = t_0, t_1, \cdots, t_N = T\}$ of $[0, T]$. We define the step function $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}(t) = (\widehat{z}_1(t), \cdots, \widehat{z}_q(t))$ by

$$\widehat{z}_j(t) = \begin{cases} z_j^{(u)} & \text{if } t_{u-1} \leq t < t_u \text{ and } u = 1, \cdots, N \\ z_j^{(N)} & \text{if } t = T \end{cases} \quad \text{for } j = 1, \cdots, q. \tag{74}$$

Let $\mathbf{w}^{(u)} = (w_1^{(u)}, \cdots, w_p^{(u)})$ for $u = 1, \cdots, N$ be feasible solutions of dual problem (DLP$^{(N)}$). We similarly define the step function $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}(t) = (\widehat{w}_1(t), \cdots, \widehat{w}_p(t))$ by

$$\widehat{w}_i(t) = \begin{cases} w_i^{(u)} & \text{if } t_{u-1} \le t < t_u \text{ and } u = 1, \cdots, N \\ w_i^{(N)} & \text{if } t = T \end{cases} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \cdots, p. \tag{75}$$

Next, we present some useful lemmas for further discussion.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose that each entry of* $\mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{c}$, B *and* K *is piecewise continuous on* $[0,T]$ *and* $[0,T] \times [0,T]$, *respectively. Given any* $\epsilon > 0$, *we can take a sufficiently small* $\| \mathcal{P} \|$ *with* $\mathcal{P} = \{t_0, t_1, \cdots, t_N\}$ *that satisfies* (50) *such that the following statements hold:*

- $a_j(t) - a_j^{(u)} < \epsilon$ *for* $j = 1, \cdots, q$, $t_{u-1} < t < t_u$ *and* $u = 1, \cdots, N$;
- $c_i(t) - c_i^{(u)} < \epsilon$ *for* $i = 1, \cdots, p$, $t_{u-1} < t < t_u$ *and* $u = 1, \cdots, N$;
- $B_{ij}^{(u)} - B_{ij}(t) < \epsilon$ *for* $i = 1, \cdots, p$, $j = 1, \cdots, q$, $t_{u-1} < t < t_u$ *and* $u = 1, \cdots, N$;
- *for fixed* t *with* $t_{u-1} < t < t_u$ *and* $u = 1, \cdots, N-1$, *we have* $K_{ij}(s,t) - K_{ij}^{(v,u)} < \epsilon$ *for* $i = 1, \cdots, p$, $j = 1, \cdots, q$, $t_{v-1} < s < t_v$ *and* $v = u+1, \cdots, N$.

Proof. According to the construction of partition $\mathcal{P}$, we see that a_j is continuous on the open interval $E_u = (t_{u-1}, t_u)$. We define the compact interval

$$E_{um} = \left[t_{u-1} + \frac{1}{m}, t_u - \frac{1}{m} \right].$$

Then

$$E_u = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} E_{um} \text{ and } E_{um_1} \subseteq E_{um_2} \text{ for } m_2 > m_1 \tag{76}$$

Since $E_{um} \subset E_u$, it follows that a_j is continuous on each compact interval E_{um}, which also means that a_j is uniformly continuous on each compact interval E_{um}. Therefore, given any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $|t_1 - t_2| < \delta$ implies

$$|a_j(t_1) - a_j(t_2)| < \epsilon \text{ for any } t_1, t_2 \in E_{um}. \tag{77}$$

Since the length of E_u is less than or equal to $\| \mathcal{P} \| \le \kappa T/N$ by (50), we can consider a sufficiently large $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\kappa T/N_0 < \delta$. In this case, each length of E_u for $l = 1, \cdots, p$ is less than δ. In other words, if $N \ge N_0$, then (77) is satisfied for any $t_1, t_2 \in E_{um}$. We consider the following cases.

- Suppose that the infimum $a_j^{(u)}$ is attained at $t_u^{(*)} \in E_u$. From (76), there exists m^* such that $t_u^{(*)} \in E_{um^*}$. Now, given any $t \in E_u$, we see that $t \in E_{um_0}$ for some m_0. Let $m = \max\{m_0, m^*\}$. From (76), it follows that $t, t_u^{(*)} \in E_{um}$. Then, we have

  $$\left| a_j(t) - a_j^{(u)} \right| = \left| a_j(t) - a_j\left(t_u^{(*)}\right) \right| < \epsilon$$

  since the length of E_{um} is less than δ, where ϵ is independent of t because of the uniform continuity.

- Suppose that the infimum $a_j^{(u)}$ is not attained at any point in E_u. Since a_j is continuous on the open interval E_u, it follows that the infimum $a_j^{(u)}$ is either the righthand limit or lefthand limit given by

  $$a_j^{(u)} = \lim_{t \to t_{u-1}+} a_j(t) \text{ or } a_j^{(u)} = \lim_{t \to t_u-} a_j(t).$$

Therefore, for sufficiently large N_0, i.e., the open interval E_u is sufficiently small such that its length is less than δ, we have

$$\left|a_j(t) - a_j^{(u)}\right| < \epsilon$$

for all $t \in E_u$.

From the above two cases, since $a_j(t) \geq a_j^{(u)}$ for all $t \in E_u$, we conclude that $a_j(t) - a_j^{(u)} < \epsilon$. The remaining cases can be similarly obtained. This completes the proof. ■

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose that the following conditions are satisfied:*

- *Suppose that each entry of* $\mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{c}$, B *and* K *is piecewise continuous on* $[0,T]$ *and* $[0,T]\times[0,T]$, *respectively;*
- *there exists a constant* $\sigma > 0$ *such that, for each* $i = 1, \cdots, p$ *and* $j = 1, \cdots, q$, *the following statement holds true a.e. in* $[0,T]$*:*

$$B_{ij}(t) \neq 0 \text{ implies } B_{ij}(t) \geq \sigma.$$

Let $(\mathbf{d}^{(1)}, \cdots, \mathbf{d}^{(N)})$ *be a feasible solution of dual problem* $(\mathrm{DLP}^{(N)})$. *Given any* $\epsilon > 0$, *there exists a sufficiently small* $\| \mathcal{P} \|$ *with* $\mathcal{P} = \{t_0, t_1, \cdots, t_N\}$ *which depends on* ϵ *such that there exists another feasible solution* $(\mathbf{w}^{(1)}, \cdots, \mathbf{w}^{(N)})$ *of dual problem* $(\mathrm{DLP}^{(N)})$ *satisfying* $\mathbf{w}^{(u)} \leq \mathbf{d}^{(u)}$ *for* $u = 1, \cdots, N$ *and*

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\widehat{\mathbf{w}}(t)dt \leq \sum_{u=1}^{N}(t_u - t_{u-1})(\mathbf{c}^{(u)})^\top \mathbf{w}^{(u)} + \epsilon, \tag{78}$$

where the step function $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}(t)$ *is defined in* (75). *If* $(\mathbf{d}^{(1)}, \cdots, \mathbf{d}^{(N)})$ *is an optimal solution of dual problem* $(\mathrm{DLP}^{(N)})$, *then* $(\mathbf{w}^{(1)}, \cdots, \mathbf{w}^{(N)})$ *can be taken as the optimal solution of dual problem* $(\mathrm{DLP}^{(N)})$.

Proof. The existence of feasible solution $(\mathbf{w}^{(1)}, \cdots, \mathbf{w}^{(N)})$ can be guaranteed by Proposition 4.3 From Lemma 5.1, given any $\bar{\epsilon} > 0$, we can take a sufficiently small $\| \mathcal{P} \|$ with $\mathcal{P} = \{t_0, t_1, \cdots, t_N\}$ that satisfies (50) such that $c_i(t) - c_i^{(u)} < \bar{\epsilon}$ for $i = 1, \cdots, p$, $t_{u-1} < t < t_u$ and $u = 1, \cdots, N$, which implies

$$c_i(t)w_i^{(u)} - c_i^{(u)}w_i^{(u)} \leq \bar{\epsilon} w_i^{(u)} \text{ for } t_{u-1} < t < t_u \text{ and } u = 1, \cdots, N \tag{79}$$

by the fact of $w_i^{(u)} \geq 0$. Since the integral does not be affected by the endpoints, taking integrations from (79), we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p}\int_0^T c_i(t)\widehat{w}_i(t)dt - \sum_{i=1}^{p}\sum_{u=1}^{N}(t_u - t_{u-1})c_i^{(u)}w_i^{(u)} \leq \| \mathcal{P} \| \bar{\epsilon} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{p}\sum_{u=1}^{N} w_i^{(u)}.$$

By the boundedness of $w_i^{(u)}$ as shown in (68), we also have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\widehat{\mathbf{w}}(t)dt - \sum_{u=1}^{N}(t_u - t_{u-1})(\mathbf{c}^{(u)})^\top \mathbf{w}^{(u)} &\leq Np\bar{\epsilon} \| \mathcal{P} \| \frac{\tau}{\sigma} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{\eta T}{\sigma}\right) \\ &\leq \kappa T p \bar{\epsilon} \cdot \frac{\tau}{\sigma} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{\eta T}{\sigma}\right) \text{ (by (50))}\end{aligned}$$

which implies, given any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a sufficiently small $\| \mathcal{P} \|$ with $\mathcal{P} = \{t_0, t_1, \cdots, t_N\}$ such that

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\widehat{\mathbf{w}}(t)dt - \sum_{u=1}^{N}(t_u - t_{u-1})(\mathbf{c}^{(u)})^\top \mathbf{w}^{(u)} \leq \epsilon.$$

This completes the proof. ■

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose that the following conditions are satisfied:*

- *each entry of* $\mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{c}$, B *and* K *is piecewise continuous on* $[0,T]$ *and* $[0,T]\times[0,T]$, *respectively;*
- $K(s,t)\geq \mathbf{0}$ *a.e. in* $[0,T]\times[0,T]$;
- $\sum_{i=1}^{p} B_{ij}(t) > 0$ *a.e. in* $[0,T]$ *for each* $j=1,\cdots,q$;
- *there exists a constant* $\sigma>0$ *such that, for each* $i=1,\cdots,p$ *and* $j=1,\cdots,q$, *the following statement holds true a.e. in* $[0,T]$:

$$B_{ij}(t)\neq 0 \text{ implies } B_{ij}(t)\geq \sigma.$$

Let $(\mathbf{d}^{(1)},\cdots\mathbf{d}^{(N)})$ *be a feasible solution of dual problem* $(\mathrm{DLP}^{(N)})$. *Given any* $\epsilon>0$, *there exists a sufficiently small* $\parallel \mathcal{P} \parallel$ *which depends on* ϵ *such that there exists another feasible solution* $(\mathbf{w}^{(1)},\cdots\mathbf{w}^{(N)})$ *of dual problem* $(\mathrm{DLP}^{(N)})$ *satisfying* $\mathbf{w}^{(u)}\leq \mathbf{d}^{(u)}$ *for* $u=1,\cdots,N$ *and*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p} B_{ij}(t)\widehat{w}_i(t)+\epsilon \geq a_j(t)+\sum_{i=1}^{p}\int_t^T K_{ij}(s,t)\widehat{w}_i(s)ds$$

for all $t\in[0,T]\setminus\mathcal{P}$ *and for* $j=1,\cdots,q$, *where the step function* $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}(t)$ *is defined in* (75). *If* $(\mathbf{d}^{(1)},\cdots\mathbf{d}^{(N)})$ *is an optimal solution of* $(\mathrm{DLP}^{(N)})$, *then* $(\mathbf{w}^{(1)},\cdots\mathbf{w}^{(N)})$ *can be taken as the optimal solution of* $(\mathrm{DLP}^{(N)})$.

Proof. The existence of feasible solution $(\mathbf{w}^{(1)},\cdots,\mathbf{w}^{(N)})$ can be guaranteed by Proposition 4.3 From Lemma 5.1, given any $\bar{\epsilon}>0$, we can take a sufficiently small $\parallel\mathcal{P}\parallel<\bar{\epsilon}$ with $\mathcal{P}=\{t_0,t_1,\cdots,t_N\}$ that satisfies (50) such that, for $u=1,\cdots,N$,

$$a_j(t)-a_j^{(u)}<\bar{\epsilon} \text{ and } B_{ij}^{(u)}-B_{ij}(t)<\bar{\epsilon} \tag{80}$$

for $t_{u-1}<t<t_u$. Therefore, for $t_{u-1}<t<t_u$,using (68), we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p} B_{ij}^{(u)}w_i^{(u)}-\sum_{i=1}^{p} B_{ij}(t)\widehat{w}_i(t)\leq \sum_{i=1}^{p}\bar{\epsilon}w_i^{(u)}\leq p\bar{\epsilon}\cdot\frac{\tau}{\sigma}\cdot\exp\left(\frac{\eta T}{\sigma}\right)\equiv\epsilon_1 \tag{81}$$

Also, from Lemma 5.1 again, for $t_{u-1}<t<t_u$, $u=1,\cdots,N-1$ and $v=u+1,\cdots,N$, we have $K_{ij}(s,t)-K_{ij}^{(v,u)}<\bar{\epsilon}$, which implies

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{t_{v-1}}^{t_v} K_{ij}(s,t)\cdot\widehat{w}_i(s)ds-(t_v-t_{v-1})\,K_{ij}^{(v,u)}w_i^{(v)}\\&\quad=\int_{t_{v-1}}^{t_v}\left(K_{ij}(s,t)-K_{ij}^{(v,u)}\right)w_i^{(v)}ds\leq\bar{\epsilon}\,(t_v-t_{v-1})\,w_i^{(v)}.\end{aligned} \tag{82}$$

By referring to (6), for $t_{u-1}<t<t_u$, we obtain

$$\int_t^{t_u} K_{ij}(s,t)w_i^{(u)}ds\leq\eta\parallel\mathcal{P}\parallel w_i^{(u)}\leq\eta\bar{\epsilon}w_i^{(u)}. \tag{83}$$

Now, for $u=1,\cdots,N-1$, $t_{u-1}<t<t_u$ and $i=1,\cdots,p$, using (82) and (83), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_t^T K_{ij}(s,t)\cdot\widehat{w}_i(s)ds-\sum_{v=u+1}^{N}(t_v-t_{v-1})\,K_{ij}^{(v,u)}w_i^{(v)}\\&\quad\leq\bar{\epsilon}w_i^{(u)}\cdot\left[\eta+\sum_{v=u+1}^{N}(t_v-t_{v-1})\right]\leq\bar{\epsilon}w_i^{(u)}\cdot(\eta+p\cdot\parallel\mathcal{P}\parallel)\end{aligned}$$

which implies, by using (68) and (50),

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p}\int_t^T K_{ij}(s,t)\cdot\widehat{w}_i(s)ds-\sum_{i=1}^{p}\sum_{v=u+1}^{N}(t_v-t_{v-1})\,K_{ij}^{(v,u)}w_i^{(v)}$$
$$\leq p\bar{\epsilon}\frac{\tau}{\sigma}\cdot\exp\left(\frac{\eta T}{\sigma}\right)\cdot(\eta+\kappa T)\equiv\epsilon_2. \tag{84}$$

For $u=1,\cdots,N-1$ and $t_{u-1}<t<t_u$, using (80), (81), (84) and the feasibility of $(\mathbf{w}^{(1)},\cdots\mathbf{w}^{(N)})$, we can obtain

$$-\sum_{i=1}^{p}B_{ij}(t)\widehat{w}_i(t)+a_j(t)+\sum_{i=1}^{p}\int_t^T K_{ij}(s,t)\widehat{w}_i(s)ds\leq\bar{\epsilon}+\epsilon_1+\epsilon_2,$$

which shows that, for $i=1,\cdots,p$, given $\bar{\epsilon}_1>0$, there exists a sufficiently small $\parallel\mathcal{P}\parallel$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p}B_{ij}(t)\widehat{w}_i(t)+\bar{\epsilon}_1\geq a_j(t)+\sum_{i=1}^{p}\int_t^T K_{ij}(s,t)\widehat{w}_i(s)ds. \tag{85}$$

For $t_{N-1}<t<T$, using the similar argument, we can show that, given $\bar{\epsilon}_2>0$, there exists a sufficiently small $\parallel\mathcal{P}\parallel$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p}B_{ij}(t)\widehat{w}_i(t)+\bar{\epsilon}_2\geq a_j(t)+\sum_{i=1}^{p}\int_t^T K_{ij}(s,t)\widehat{w}_i(s)ds. \tag{86}$$

From (85) and (86), we complete the proof. ■

Let $M(\epsilon)$ and $\widehat{M}(\epsilon)$ be the optimal objective values of (CLP_ϵ) and (DCLP_ϵ), respectively. Under the assumptions of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, we see that there exist optimal solutions $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}$ of problems (CLP_ϵ) and (DCLP_ϵ), respectively, such that

$$M(\epsilon)=\int_0^T\mathbf{a}^\top(t)\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}(t)dt\text{ and }\widehat{M}(\epsilon)=\int_0^T\mathbf{c}^\top(t)\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t)dt.$$

Also, by taking $\epsilon=0$ in Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, there exist optimal solutions $\mathbf{z}^*$ and $\mathbf{w}^*$ of problems (CLP) and (DCLP), respectively, such that $\mathbf{z}^*$ and $\mathbf{w}^*$ satisfy the following inequalities:

$$z_j^*(t)\leq\frac{p\cdot\zeta}{\sigma}\cdot\exp\left(\frac{p\cdot\phi\cdot T}{\sigma}\right)\text{ a.e. in }[0,T]\text{ for each }j=1,\cdots,q \tag{87}$$

from (13) by taking $\epsilon=0$, and

$$w_i^*(t)\leq\frac{\tau}{\sigma}\cdot\exp\left(\frac{\nu\cdot T}{\sigma}\right)\text{ for all }t\in[0,T]\text{ and for each }i=1,\cdots,p \tag{88}$$

from (44). Let M and $\widehat{M}$ be the optimal objective values of (CLP) and (DCLP), respectively. Then, we see that

$$M(0)=M=\int_0^T\mathbf{a}^\top(t)\mathbf{z}^*(t)dt\text{ and }\widehat{M}(0)=\widehat{M}=\int_0^T\mathbf{c}^\top(t)\mathbf{w}^*(t)dt.$$

We are going to show that the functions $M(\epsilon)$ and $\widehat{M}(\epsilon)$ are right-continuous at 0.

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose that the following conditions are satisfied:*

- *each entry of* $\mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{c}$, B *and* K *is piecewise continuous in* $[0,T]$ *and* $[0,T]\times[0,T]$, *respectively;*

- $\mathbf{c}(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ *a.e. in* $[0,T]$*;*
- $K(t,s) \geq \mathbf{0}$ *a.e. in* $[0,T] \times [0,T]$*;*
- $\sum_{i=1}^{p} B_{ij}(t) > 0$ *a.e. in* $[0,T]$ *for each* $j = 1, \cdots, q$*;*
- *there exists a constant* $\sigma > 0$ *such that, for each* $i = 1, \cdots, p$ *and* $j = 1, \cdots, q$*, the following statement holds true a.e. in* $[0,T]$*:*

$$B_{ij}(t) \neq 0 \text{ implies } B_{ij}(t) \geq \sigma.$$

Then, we have the following results.

(i) *The function* $M(\epsilon)$ *is nondecreasing and right-continuous at* 0*, i.e.,* $M(0+) = M(0)$*, and*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0+} \int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t) \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) dt = \int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t) \mathbf{z}^*(t) dt, \tag{89}$$

where $\mathbf{z}^*$ *is an optimal solution of* (CLP) *such that* $\mathbf{z}^*(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ *for all* $t \in [0,T]$ *and the inequalities in* (87) *are satisfied. Moreover, the following results hold.*

- *If* $\mathbf{c}(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ *for all* $t \in [0,T]$ *and, for each fixed* $t_0 \in [0,T]$*,* $K(t_0, s) \geq \mathbf{0}$ *a.e. in* $[0,T]$*, Then, there exists a common optimal solution* $\mathbf{z}^*$ *of* (CLP) *and* (CLP*) *such that both problems have the same optimal objective values and* $\mathbf{z}^*$ *satisfies the inequalities* (87)*;*
- *If the conditions regarding the time-dependent matrix* $B(t)$ *are satisfied for all* $t \in [0,T]$*, then the inequalities in* (87) *are satisfied for all* $t \in [0,T]$*.*

(ii) *The function* $\widehat{M}(\epsilon)$ *is nonincreasing and right-continuous at* 0*, i.e.,* $\widehat{M}(0+) = \widehat{M}(0)$*, and*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0+} \int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t) \bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t) dt = \int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t) \mathbf{w}^*(t) dt, \tag{90}$$

where $\mathbf{w}^*$ *is the optimal solution of* (DCLP) *such that* $\mathbf{w}^*(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ *for all* $t \in [0,T]$ *and the inequalities* (88) *are satisfied. If we further assume that the conditions regarding the time-dependent matrix* $B(t)$ *are satisfied for all* $t \in [0,T]$*, and that the function* $\sum_{i=1}^{p} K_{ij}$ *is bounded by* ν *and the function* a_j *is bounded by* τ *for each* $j = 1, \cdots, q$*, then there exists a common optimal solution* $\mathbf{w}^*$ *of* (DCLP) *and* (DCLP*) *such that both problems have the same optimal objective values and the inequalities in* (88) *are satisfied.*

Proof. We want to show that $M(\epsilon)$ is nondecreasing. For $\epsilon_1 < \epsilon_2$, there exist optimal solutions $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{\epsilon_1}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{\epsilon_2}$ satisfying

$$B(t)\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{\epsilon_2}(t) \leq \mathbf{c}(t) + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_2 + \int_0^t K(t,s)\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{\epsilon_2}(s) ds \text{ for all } t \in [0,T] \tag{91}$$

and

$$B(t)\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{\epsilon_1}(t) \leq \mathbf{c}(t) + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_1 + \int_0^t K(t,s)\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{\epsilon_1}(s) ds \leq \mathbf{c}(t) + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_2 + \int_0^t K(t,s)\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{\epsilon_1}(s) ds \text{ for all } t \in [0,T]. \tag{92}$$

From (92), we see that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{\epsilon_1}$ is a feasible solution of (CLP$_{\epsilon_2}$). Therefore, we obtain $M(\epsilon_1) \leq M(\epsilon_2)$, since (CLP$_{\epsilon_2}$) is a maximization problem. This shows that $M(\epsilon)$ is indeed nondecreasing, i.e., $M(0+)$ exists. We also have

$$M = M(0) \leq M(0+). \tag{93}$$

We consider the sequence $\{\epsilon_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ such that $\epsilon_k \to 0+$ as $k \to \infty$. Using (13) in Proposition 3.1 by taking $\lambda_i(t) = 1$ for $i = 1, \cdots, p$ and Remark 3.1, we see that the sequence $\{\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon_k)}\}$ is uniformly

essentially bounded. Using part (i) of Proposition 3.2, there exists a subsequence $\{\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}\}$ which weakly converges to some feasible solution $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)} \in L_q^2[0,T]$ of $(\mathrm{CLP}_0) = (\mathrm{CLP})$. Moreover, there exists a feasible solution $\mathbf{z}^*$ of $(\mathrm{CLP}_0) = (\mathrm{CLP})$ such that $\mathbf{z}^*(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in [0,T]$ and $\mathbf{z}^*(t) = \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}(t)$ a.e. in $[0,T]$. Therefore, using the weak convergence, we have

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t)\mathbf{z}^*(t)dt = \int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t)\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(0)}(t)dt = \lim_{r\to\infty}\int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t)\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}(t)dt = \lim_{r\to\infty} M(\epsilon_{k_r}) = M(0+). \quad (94)$$

Since $\mathbf{z}^*$ is a feasible solution of $(\mathrm{CLP}_0) = (\mathrm{CLP})$, we also have

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t)\mathbf{z}^*(t)dt \leq M = M(0). \quad (95)$$

Therefore, according to (95) and (94), we obtain $M(0+) \leq M(0)$, which implies $M(0+) = M(0) = M$ by (93). This says that $\mathbf{z}^*$ is an optimal solution of (CLP) and proves equality (89). If we further assume that $\mathbf{c}(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in [0,T]$ and, for each fixed $t_0 \in [0,T]$, $K(t_0,s) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e. in $[0,T]$, using part (ii) of Proposition 3.2, we see that $\mathbf{z}^*$ is also a feasible solution of (CLP^*). Therefore, we conclude that $\mathbf{z}^*$ is also an optimal solution of (CLP^*), since the feasible set of (CLP^*) is contained in the feasible set of (CLP). On the other hand, if the assumption regarding the time-dependent matrix $B(t)$ is satisfied for all $t \in [0,T]$, Then, according to (13) in Proposition 3.1, the inequalities in (87) are satisfied for all $t \in [0,T]$. This proves part (i).

To prove part (ii), we can similarly show that $\widehat{M}(\epsilon)$ is nonincreasing and $\widehat{M} = \widehat{M}(0) \geq \widehat{M}(0+)$. From (44) in Theorem 3.2, we have

$$0 \leq \bar{w}_i^{(\epsilon)}(t) \leq \frac{\tau}{\sigma}\cdot\exp\left[\frac{\nu\cdot(T-t)}{\sigma}\right] \leq \frac{\tau}{\sigma}\cdot\exp\left(\frac{\nu\cdot T}{\sigma}\right) \text{ for all } t \in [0,T],$$

which says that the sequence $\{\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon_k)}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is uniformly essentially bounded. Using Proposition 3.5, there exists a subsequence $\{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}\}_{r=1}^{\infty}$ which weakly converges to some feasible solution $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(0)} \in L_p^2[0,T]$ of $(\mathrm{DCLP}_0) = (\mathrm{DCLP})$ such that $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}(t) \leq \bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}(t)$ a.e. in $[0,T]$. Moreover, there exists a feasible solution $\mathbf{w}^*$ of $(\mathrm{DCLP}_0) = (\mathrm{DCLP})$ such that $\mathbf{w}^*(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in [0,T]$ and $\mathbf{w}^*(t) = \widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(0)}(t)$ a.e. in $[0,T]$. Therefore, using the weak convergence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\mathbf{w}^*(t)dt &= \int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(0)}(t)dt = \lim_{r\to\infty}\int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\widehat{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}(t)dt \\ &\leq \lim_{r\to\infty}\int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon_{k_r})}(t)dt = \lim_{r\to\infty}\widehat{M}(\epsilon_{k_r}) = \widehat{M}(0+).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbf{w}^*$ is a feasible solution of $(\mathrm{DCLP}_0) = (\mathrm{DCLP})$, we also have

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\mathbf{w}^*(t)dt \geq \widehat{M} = \widehat{M}(0).$$

Therefore, we obtain $\widehat{M}(0+) \geq \widehat{M}(0)$, which also implies

$$\widehat{M}(0+) = \int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\mathbf{w}^*(t)dt = \widehat{M}(0) = \widehat{M},$$

This shows that $\mathbf{w}^*$ is an optimal solution of (DCLP), and proves the equality (90).

We further assume that the conditions regarding the time-dependent matrix $B(t)$ are satisfied for all $t \in [0,T]$, and that the function $\sum_{i=1}^p K_{ij}$ is bounded by ν and the function a_j is bounded by τ for each $j = 1,\cdots,q$. Then, part (iii) of Proposition 3.5 says that we can take $\mathbf{w}^*$ as a feasible solution of (DCLP^*). Since the feasible set of (DCLP^*) is contained in the feasible set of (DCLP), it follows that $\mathbf{w}^*$ is an optimal solution of problem (DCLP^*). This completes the proof. ■

Now, we are in a position to prove the strong duality theorem.

Theorem 5.1. (Strong Duality Theorem) *Suppose that the following conditions are satisfied:*

- *each entry of* $\mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{c}$, B *and* K *is piecewise continuous in* $[0,T]$ *and* $[0,T]\times[0,T]$, *respectively;*
- $\mathbf{c}(t)\geq\mathbf{0}$ *a.e. in* $[0,T]$*;*
- $K(t,s)\geq\mathbf{0}$ *a.e. in* $[0,T]\times[0,T]$*;*
- *the time-dependent matrix* $B(t)$ *satisfies the following conditions:*
  - $\sum_{i=1}^{p}B_{ij}(t)>0$ *a.e. in* $[0,T]$ *for each* $j=1,\cdots,q$*;*
  - *there exists a constant* $\sigma>0$ *such that, for each* $i=1,\cdots,p$ *and* $j=1,\cdots,q$, *the following statement holds true a.e. in* $[0,T]$*:*

$$B_{ij}(t)\neq 0 \text{ implies } B_{ij}(t)\geq\sigma.$$

Then, there exist optimal solutions $\mathbf{z}^*$ *and* $\mathbf{w}^*$ *of problems* (CLP) *and* (DCLP), *respectively, such that*

$$\int_0^T\mathbf{a}^\top(t)\mathbf{z}^*(t)dt=\int_0^T\mathbf{c}^\top(t)\mathbf{w}^*(t)dt,$$

where $\mathbf{z}^*(t)\geq\mathbf{0}$ *and* $\mathbf{w}^*(t)\geq\mathbf{0}$ *for all* $t\in[0,T]$, *and the inequalities in* (87) *and* (88) *are all satisfied. Moreover, the following results hold.*

- *If* $\mathbf{c}(t)\geq\mathbf{0}$ *for all* $t\in[0,T]$ *and, for each fixed* $t_0\in[0,T]$, $K(t_0,s)\geq\mathbf{0}$ *a.e. in* $[0,T]$, *then there exists a common optimal solution* $\mathbf{z}^*$ *of problems* (CLP) *and* (CLP*) *such that both problems have the same optimal objective value.*
- *If we further assume that the conditions regarding the time-dependent matrix* $B(t)$ *are satisfied for all* $t\in[0,T]$, *and that the function* $\sum_{i=1}^{p}K_{ij}$ *is bounded by* ν *and the function* a_j *is bounded by* τ *for each* $j=1,\cdots,q$, *then there exists a common optimal solution* $\mathbf{w}^*$ *of* (DCLP) *and* (DCLP*) *such that both problems have the same optimal objective value and the inequalities* (87) *are satisfied for all* $t\in[0,T]$.

Proof. Since the primal and dual pair of linear programming problems (LP$^{(N)}$) and (DLP$^{(N)}$) are feasible by Proposition 4.1, the strong duality theorem says that there exist optimal solutions $(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)},\cdots,\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(N)})$ and $(\bar{\mathbf{d}}^{(1)},\cdots,\bar{\mathbf{d}}^{(N)})$ of problems (LP$^{(N)}$) and (DLP$^{(N)}$), respectively, such that

$$\sum_{u=1}^{N}(t_u-t_{u-1})\,(\mathbf{a}^{(u)})^\top\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(u)}=\sum_{u=1}^{N}(t_u-t_{u-1})\,(\mathbf{c}^{(u)})^\top\bar{\mathbf{d}}^{(u)}. \tag{96}$$

Since the integral does not be affected by the endpoints, from (74), it is not hard to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T\mathbf{a}^\top(t)\widehat{\mathbf{z}}(t)dt&=\sum_{j=1}^{q}\int_0^T a_j(t)\widehat{z}_j(t)dt\\&\geq\sum_{j=1}^{q}\sum_{u=1}^{N}(t_u-t_{u-1})a_j^{(u)}\bar{z}_j^{(u)}=\sum_{u=1}^{N}(t_u-t_{u-1})(\mathbf{a}^{(u)})^\top\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(u)}.\end{aligned} \tag{97}$$

Considering $t\in[0,T]\setminus\mathcal{P}$, since $K(t,s)$ is continuous on the open rectangles $(t_{u-1},t_u)\times(t_{v-1},t_v)$ and $K(t,s)\geq\mathbf{0}$ a.e. in $(t_{u-1},t_u)\times(t_{v-1},t_v)$ for $u=1,\cdots,N$ and $v=1,\cdots,N$, it follows that $K(t,s)\geq\mathbf{0}$ for all $(t,s)\in(t_{u-1},t_u)\times(t_{v-1},t_v)$ for $u=1,\cdots,N$ and $v=1,\cdots,N$, which implies $K_{ij}^{(u,v)}\geq 0$ for $u=1,\cdots,N$ and $v=1,\cdots,N$. Since $z_j^{(v)}\geq 0$ and $K_{ij}(t,s)\geq K_{ij}^{(u,v)}$ for

$t_{u-1} < t < t_u$ and $t_{v-1} < s < t_v$, we have $K_{ij}(t,s)z_j^{(v)} \geq K_{ij}^{(u,v)} z_j^{(v)}$. Since the integral does not be affected by the endpoints, for $t_{u-1} < t < t_u$, we obtain

$$-\sum_{j=1}^{q}\int_0^t K_{ij}(t,s)\widehat{z}_j(s)ds \leq -\sum_{j=1}^{q}\sum_{v=1}^{u-1}(t_v - t_{v-1})\, K_{ij}^{(u,v)} z_j^{(v)}. \tag{98}$$

Since $c_i(t) \geq c_i^{(u)}$ and $B_{ij}(t) \leq B_{ij}^{(u)}$, using (98) and the feasibility of $(\mathbf{z}^{(1)}, \cdots, \mathbf{z}^{(N)})$, after some calculations, we can obtain the following inequalities

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q} B_{ij}(t)\widehat{z}_j(t) \leq c_i(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{q}\int_0^t K_{ij}(t,s)\widehat{z}_j(s)ds$$

for all $t \in [0,T] \setminus \mathcal{P}$ and for $i = 1, \cdots, p$, which implies, for $\epsilon > 0$,

$$B(t)\widehat{\mathbf{z}}(t) \leq \mathbf{c}(t) + \boldsymbol{\epsilon} + \int_0^t K(t,s)\widehat{\mathbf{z}}(s)ds \text{ for all } t \in [0,T] \setminus \mathcal{P} \tag{99}$$

Considering the dual problem (DLP$^{(N)}$), applying Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3, there exists a sufficiently small $\parallel \mathcal{P} \parallel$ which depends on ϵ such that $(\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(1)}, \cdots, \bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(N)})$ is an optimal solution of problem (DLP$^{(N)}$) and the following inequalities are satisfied:

$$B^\top(t)\widehat{\mathbf{w}}(t) + \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \geq \mathbf{a}(t) + \int_t^T K^\top(s,t)\widehat{\mathbf{w}}(s)ds \text{ for all } t \in [0,T] \setminus \mathcal{P} \tag{100}$$

and

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\widehat{\mathbf{w}}(t)dt \leq \sum_{u=1}^{N}(t_u - t_{u-1})\,(\mathbf{c}^{(u)})^\top \mathbf{w}^{(u)} + \epsilon. \tag{101}$$

From (96), we also have

$$\sum_{u=1}^{N}(t_u - t_{u-1})\,(\mathbf{a}^{(u)})^\top \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(u)} = \sum_{u=1}^{N}(t_u - t_{u-1})\,(\mathbf{c}^{(u)})^\top \bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(u)}. \tag{102}$$

The inequalities (99) and (100) say that $\widehat{\mathbf{z}}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}$ are feasible solutions of problems (CLP$_\epsilon$) and (DCLP$_\epsilon$), respectively. By Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, we see that there exist optimal solutions $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}$ of (CLP$_\epsilon$) and (DCLP$_\epsilon$), respectively, such that

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t)\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}dt \geq \int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t)\widehat{\mathbf{z}}(t)dt \text{ and } \int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}dt \leq \int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\widehat{\mathbf{w}}(t)dt. \tag{103}$$

Using (103), (97) and (101), we have

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t)\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}dt \geq \sum_{u=1}^{N}(t_u - t_{u-1})\,(\mathbf{a}^{(u)})^\top \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(u)} \tag{104}$$

and

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t)dt \leq \sum_{u=1}^{N}(t_u - t_{u-1})\,(\mathbf{c}^{(u)})^\top \bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(u)} + \epsilon. \tag{105}$$

From (102), (104) and (105), we obtain

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t)dt \leq \int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t)\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}dt + \epsilon. \tag{106}$$

Since $M(\epsilon) \uparrow M(0) = M$ and $\widehat{M}(\epsilon) \downarrow \widehat{M}(0) = \widehat{M}$ as $\epsilon \to 0+$ by Proposition 5.1, for each $\epsilon > 0$, we obtain

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t)\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(\epsilon)}(t)dt \leq \int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t)\mathbf{z}^*(t)dt \text{ and } \int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\bar{\mathbf{w}}^{(\epsilon)}(t)dt \geq \int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\mathbf{w}^*(t)dt. \tag{107}$$

By (106) and (107), we have

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\mathbf{w}^*(t)dt \leq \int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t)\mathbf{z}^*(t)dt + \epsilon,$$

which implies

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\mathbf{w}^*(t)dt \leq \int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t)\mathbf{z}^*(t)dt,$$

since ϵ can be any positive number. By the weak duality Theorem 2.1, we conclude that

$$\int_0^T \mathbf{c}^\top(t)\mathbf{w}^*(t)dt = \int_0^T \mathbf{a}^\top(t)\mathbf{z}^*(t)dt.$$

Also, the inequalities regarding the bounds of optimal solutions $\mathbf{z}^*$ and $\mathbf{w}^*$ follow from Proposition 5.1 immediately.

If $\mathbf{c}(t) \geq \mathbf{0}$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ and, for each fixed $t_0 \in [0, T]$, $K(t_0, s) \geq \mathbf{0}$ a.e. in $[0, T]$, then part (i) of Proposition 5.1 says that $\mathbf{z}^*$ is a common optimal solution of problems (CLP) and (CLP*) such that both problems have the same optimal objective value.

Finally, we further assume that the conditions regarding the time-dependent matrix $B(t)$ are satisfied for all $t \in [0, T]$, and that the function $\sum_{i=1}^p K_{ij}$ is bounded by ν and the function a_j is bounded by τ for each $j = 1, \cdots, q$. Then, part (ii) of Proposition 5.1 says that $\mathbf{w}^*$ is a common optimal solution of problems (DCLP) and (DCLP*) such that both problems have the same optimal objective value. Also, part (i) of Proposition 5.1 says that the inequalities (87) are satisfied for all $t \in [0, T]$. This completes the proof. ■

References

[1] E.J. Anderson, P. Nash and A.F. Perold, *Some properties of a class of continuous linear programs*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization 21 (1983), pp.758-765.

[2] E.J. Anderson and A.B. Philpott, *On the solutions of a class of continuous linear programs*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization 32 (1994), pp.1289-1296.

[3] E.J. Anderson and M.C. Pullan, *Purification for separated continuous linear programs*, Mathematical Methods of Operations Research 43 (1996), pp.9-33.

[4] R.E. Bellman, *Dynamic Programming*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1957.

[5] L. Fleischer and J. Sethuraman, *Efficient algorithms for separated continuous linear programs: the multicommodity flow problem with holding costs and extensions*, Mathematics of Operations Research 30 (2005), pp.916-938.

[6] N. Levinson, *A class of continuous linear programming problems*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications 16 (1966), pp.73-83.

[7] R. Meidan and A.F. Perold, *Optimality conditions and strong duality in abstract and continuous-time linear programming*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications 40 (1983), pp.61-77.

[8] N.S. Papageorgiou, *A class of infinite dimensional linear programming problems*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications 87 (1982), pp.228-245.

[9] M.C. Pullan, *An algorithm for a class of continuous linear programs*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization 31 (1993), pp.1558-1577.

[10] M.C. Pullan, *Forms of optimal solutions for separated continuous linear programs*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization 33 (1995), pp.1952-1977.

[11] M.C. Pullan, *A duality theory for separated continuous linear programs*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization 34 (1996), pp.931-965.

[12] M.C. Pullan, *Convergence of a general class of algorithms for separated continuous linear programs*, SIAM Journal on Optimization 10 (2000), pp.722-731.

[13] M.C. Pullan, *An extended algorithm for separated continuous linear programs*, Mathematical Programming Ser. A 93 (2002), pp.415-451.

[14] F. Riesz and B. Sz.-Nagy, *Functional Analysis*, Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., New York, 1955.

[15] H.L. Royden, *Real Analysis* (3rd), 1988.

[16] M. Schechter, *Duality in continuous linear programming*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications 37 (1972), pp.130-141.

[17] W.F. Tyndall, *A duality theorem for a class of continuous linear programming problems*, SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics 15 (1965), pp.644-666.

[18] W.F. Tyndall, *An extended duality theorem for continuous linear programming problems*, SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics 15 (1967), pp.1294-1298.

[19] G. Weiss, *A simplex based algorithm to solve separated continuous linear programs*, Mathematical Programming, Ser. A 115 (2008), pp.151-198.

[20] H.-C. Wu, *Continuous-Time Linear Programming Problems Revisited: A Perturbation Approach*, Optimization 62 (2013) 33-70.

[21] H.-C. Wu, *Erratum: Continuous-Time Linear Programming Problems Revisited*, optimization.